



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2005

No. 76

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Eternal Father of all and well-spring of youthful dreams, bless the young women and men who have served these past months as pages of the U.S. House of Representatives. As their term of service comes to an end, inspire each of them with expansive hopes and fill them with great aspirations to create powerful futures both for themselves and for this Nation.

We praise You and we thank You for their families and all of those who have mentored the pages in their program: their work, their school, and in their dorm. May this experience of government at work deepen their commitment to learning and their ability to make friends with diverse people from across the Nation, forming them into leaders for tomorrow.

May the Members of Congress surrounded by such youthful presence grow in their tender understanding of America's young people, their needs, their dreams, their problems, their values, and their abilities.

Ever-living Lord, help young and old Americans alike develop skills to cross the generational divide, that we may all grow up to be one Nation under God. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLAKE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 10 1-minute speeches on each side.

### BANNING BOOKS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, a 10-year-old Knoxville, Tennessee child, Luke Whitson, and some of his friends chose to read the Bible to each other during recesses instead of playing on the jungle gym or kickball. Luke's principal was not amused. She put a stop on this terrible practice at once and told the students not to bring their Bibles to school again.

Now, we expect principals to protect kids from bullying and ensure a healthy learning environment. We do not expect them to dictate issues of faith or, worse, mandate a faith-free environment. However, this principal is a ground soldier in a national campaign to remove faith, even voluntary expressions of it, from publicly funded programs and facilities.

School children, all people, should have the right to read freely in their own free time, whether it is during recess at school or in the break room during lunch at work.

Our government buys and provides copies of the Koran and prayer rugs to terrorist prisoners at Gitmo. We expect our soldiers to honor a terrorist's right to worship freely, but will we stand for the right of an American child to do so as well? Sounds like somebody is paranoid.

### PRINCIPLES OF TAX REFORM

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, we have a tax system that is needlessly complicated and burdensome to the middle class. It is time for fundamental tax reform that reflects the values and the interests of all Americans, not the special interests.

When President Bush announced his tax reform commission, he said his core principle was that it should not hurt government revenues.

Democrats believe that the core principle of tax reform is that tax reform should help the middle class achieve their goals. Tax reform is about the middle class and economic growth, not about government revenue.

In the last 4 years the Tax Code has been filled with special breaks for special interests. At the same time, the tax burdens have shifted from the wealthy to those who work, from dividend to wages.

What should we do?

Combine the five educational tax breaks to one tax break for higher education for \$3,000 for everybody going to college; unify the various child credits and earned income tax credit to a single simplified tax family credit; simplify the 16 different versions of the Tax Code for savings to one universal 401(k) pension; and, finally, encourage homeownership. We should create a universal mortgage deduction for all taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, we need a tax system that reflects the American values and fosters the American Dream, not the current system written by and for the special interests.

### SOCIAL SECURITY PROPERTY RIGHTS

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4299

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the national debate on Social Security reform, I am left wondering why no one is talking about America's greatest principles, and that is property rights.

I get letters, e-mails, and phone calls every day from my constituents demanding that I do not take away their guaranteed Social Security benefits. That leads me to believe that our Nation's citizens may not understand that they really have no legal right to their Social Security benefits.

The Supreme Court ruled in *Flemming v. Nestor* that there is no legal right to Social Security benefits. In the eyes of the Court, it is deemed a tax-and-spend program in which Congress can change the rules regarding eligibility at any time, and it has many times over in past years. That is how our current system works.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for reform. It is time to give American taxpayers back their personal property rights. Personal accounts would give workers true legal property rights to their contributions and their benefits. They could not be raided to pay for other programs. Personal accounts are the ultimate lockbox.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, as so many American families struggle with the rising costs of health care and with the unavailability of health care, I think it is important to keep in mind that roughly one-third of every health care dollar goes to wasteful administration and profit. The result is that we pay more for our health care than any other industrialized country by a wide margin.

Since American businesses are the main provider of health care in the United States, they bear the burden and it is hurting their competitiveness. How do we know? Our competition tells us so.

The CEO of the Ford Motor Company of Canada, the president and CEO of GM Canada, and the CEO of DaimlerChrysler Canada had this to say in a 2002 letter: "Publicly funded health care thus accounts for a significant portion of Canada's overall labor cost advantage in auto assembly, versus the U.S. which in turn has been a significant factor in maintaining and attracting new auto investment to Canada."

The time has come for national health insurance.

#### HEALTH CARE COSTS

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America's health care system is indeed in need of fixing on so many levels. You can lose count of the number of problems that it has. One of the major issues is cost.

Recent studies show that the average American pays close to \$4,000 a year on health care. However, that figure pales in comparison to the \$11,000 that health care costs for America's seniors each.

The last time this study was conducted in 1989, the average cost was only \$2,200. Health care has become big business and big government, and patients are further removed from their doctors. Decisions that should be made between doctors and patients are now being decided many times by somebody else. Rising costs affect everyone: patients, doctors, and even small businesses that can no longer afford health insurance for their employees.

Regardless of who pays, patients should have a choice when it comes to their health care, plain and simple. H. Res. 215 would do just that. As we move forward, we must be on the patients' side; they know what is best for themselves.

#### PROTECT OUR NATION

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership pulled the intelligence authorization bill from the floor today because the leadership here is doing the dirty work of Defense Secretary Rumsfeld.

We all know that Rumsfeld was against the intelligence reforms that the 9/11 Commission suggested, and now he is trying to prevent those reforms from moving forward. The Republican leadership is keeping the intelligence bill from coming to the floor today because Secretary Rumsfeld does not want to give up any intelligence control to new Intelligence Director Negroponte.

Let us be clear, Secretary Rumsfeld and the Republican leadership are preventing intelligence reform that could make our Nation safer than it is today.

The 9/11 commissioners warned us earlier this week that time is not on our side. It is time the House Republican leadership stops listening to Rumsfeld and starts listening to the 9/11 Commission so we can finally begin to protect our Nation.

#### SHELF LIFE FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, so often people come to this Chamber and say the way we deal with health care costs is to change who pays. What we need to talk about is what we are paying for.

The Department of Defense Extended Shelf Life Program evaluated over 312 drug products and found that even though they were given a date of shelf life, many of them maintain their stability, safety and potency up to as much as an additional 107 months past their expiration dates.

For the \$3.9 million the military spent on stability testing on expired drugs, it saved \$263 million. These are savings worth exploring, and I would urge my colleagues to support careful scientific review of expiration dates for prescription drugs and ask if the savings gained by the military can be applied to general health care spending.

My colleagues can learn more about these ideas for savings and health care by visiting my Web site at [Murphy.house.gov](http://Murphy.house.gov) and continue to change the way we look at health care to what we are paying for.

#### INDIANAPOLIS 500

(Ms. CARSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 89th running of the greatest spectacular in racing, the Indianapolis 500 held at Indianapolis Motor Speedway.

Congratulations to the winner, Dan Wheldon of Andretti-Green Racing, whose victory was not an easy one. Wheldon's winning highlight was a dramatic pass of the sensational rookie Danica Patrick with only six laps left in the race.

Although Danica Patrick may not have won, she made history. Danica Patrick of Rahal-Letterman finished in fourth place, the best finish ever for a woman.

□ 1015

She also had the highest starting position for a woman and was the first woman to lead a lap at the Indianapolis 500.

I would like to congratulate Dan Wheldon, Danica Patrick and the entire field of 33 drivers, their racing teams, the Indianapolis Racing League and the Indianapolis Motor Speedway for a spectacular race. Congratulations again.

#### ONE THING I KNOW FOR CERTAIN

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as a former small business owner, one thing that I know for certain is that there is not a nation on this earth that has ever taxed itself into prosperity. Raising taxes and increasing regulation absolutely does not create economic growth. It is a guarantee that you are going to get less of what you want. We know that by reducing regulation and reducing taxes that we see economic growth and we see jobs growth.

Mr. Speaker, America has now recovered economically from the tragedy of September 11. We have grown our economy out of recession and passed the tremendous blow on September of 2001, and we did it by reducing regulation and lowering taxes, by working to change the budget process, by reducing what the Federal Government spends, with the budget we have passed this year, by beginning to root out waste, fraud and abuse and being aggressive in that. In other words, we are working to make America competitive.

Mr. Speaker, I salute our Republican leadership for their commitment to this.

#### DISBAND THE CURRENT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, in fairness to Members of this body who have been subjected to a cloud of suspicion over ethics allegations, I rise today to call for the House to disband the current Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and reconstitute it as a panel that can convene and hear the cases pending before it.

A report in the Washington Post today says the committee may be inactive for months and it may not take up politically charged accusations against a high-ranking leader until next year, which just happens to be an election year.

The Post says, "Democrats are hoping to gain political advantage from investigations into DELAY's activities and overseas travel and his ties to lobbyist Jack Abramoff."

Even the Democratic-friendly Washington Post sees the political calculations behind the minority's tactics.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is stalled by a partisan logjam, and I see only one way to unplug it: reconstitute the panel with Members resolved to work together so that it can move forward with its work. If this good-faith effort fails again, the House needs to install a Republican majority on the committee so that the wheels of good government can turn once more.

Mr. Speaker, this body rescinded the ethics rules passed earlier this Congress to appease the minority's demands. Yet, the minority party continues to obstruct the objectives of the Ethics Committee at every turn.

I believe the Republican majority should pass whatever rules necessary so the committee can and will act fairly to hear the pending cases before it—cases that involve both Republicans and Democrats.

Members accused of violations deserve a chance to make their cases and perhaps clear their names.

#### WE MUST STOP THE BLOODSHED IN SUDAN

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the meeting between the Prime Minister of Britain and this administration.

If one thing has come out of that meeting beyond the need for the \$50 billion for the restoration of the continent of Africa, it is that we must act now to stop the bleeding, the bloodshed and the brutality in Darfur and Sudan.

This week is the 10th year recognition commemoration of the million that died in Rwanda, and we are reminded that they died because of our nonaction, our inertia, our refusal to accept the fact that people were being brutalized and killed. The U.S. did not act.

It is important that military assistance be sent to Sudan now and that the President of Chad be included in this process for the 300,000 refugees that are languishing in Chad without any resources from around the world.

The United States must act, the Congress must act. A declaration of genocide has already been declared. Do we want another Rwanda on our hands, more blood, more bloodshed and loss of life? We cannot afford it. The African Union must be sent. We must stop the bloodshed in Sudan and return the people to their land.

#### JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Congress on its successful, pro-growth economic agenda.

In the last month alone, the United States economy created 78,000 new jobs. Take the last 2 years into account, and our economy has created more than 3.5 million jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this growth can be partially credited to the good legislation Congress has passed, legislation that lowers taxes, lets Americans keep more of their hard-earned money, reduces unnecessary regulation, supports our small businesses, and, above all, it encourages economic growth.

Our policies are working. More Americans hold jobs today than ever before. Homeownership is at a near record level, with nearly 70 percent of American families owning their own homes. Small businesses continue to flourish, and our economy is showing steady growth.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that our economic agenda is the right solution for American families. We will continue passing good legislation to build a stronger economy for all Americans.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HON. HENRY HYDE AND THE HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and also the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who worked with me yesterday to attach an amendment to the State Department authorization bill to allow some of the funding that we provide to the State Department to be spent on scholarships and other programs for Cubans.

For years, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars at the State Department on public diplomacy programs that have helped individuals in countries transitioning to a democracy. Yet Cuba has been excluded from this. If there is any country that needs this help and a people that need this help, it is the country of Cuba.

So now the State Department has been directed to spend at least \$5 million in Fulbright scholarships, Ben Gilman scholarships, Truman scholarships and others to bring worthy Cubans here to the United States to study and help reverse the tide recently of less contact with the Cuban people, to actually have more contact.

This is significant. Again, I pay tribute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for working with me on this.

#### AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS AND COOL LEGISLATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the important work this body undertook last night by passing the fiscal year 2006 Agriculture Appropriations Act. This bill took an important step toward helping the farmers of America and my district in North Carolina. Farmers are the backbone of our communities, and we must provide the resources they need. My colleagues and I worked hard to exercise fiscal restraint on this bill without cutting those programs crucial to helping farmers. I feel strongly the bill we passed yesterday did just that.

I would also like to thank this body for voting to uphold a provision that delays the country-of-origin labeling process until it can be dealt with correctly, through current proposed legislation. This delay will allow my colleagues and me on the House Committee on Agriculture time to complete our work on H.R. 2068, the Meat Promotion Act of 2005 sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman GOODLATTE).

H.R. 2068 will establish a market-driven, cost-effective, voluntary COOL program for meat such as beef, poultry and pork.

# PRODUCTIVITY OF THE 109TH CONGRESS TO DATE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, with all of the negative press these days, one of the big stories that has been missed is how productive this Congress has been since the first of the year. In fact, this may be one of the most productive Congresses this country has seen since the Second World War.

Let me go through with my colleagues very quickly the 20 pieces of major legislation we have passed this year and the five appropriations bills we have passed since the beginning of the year.

We passed a class action fairness bill. We passed a highway bill and energy bill and our budget and the Real ID Act, which will strengthen our borders, and a bill for broadcast decency. We passed a continuity of the Congress bill, gang deterrence, funding for first responders, vocational and technical funding, homeland security. We have repealed estate tax for the second time, spyware prevention, bankruptcy bill, core blood registry, stem cell funding, restrictions on interstate transport for minors seeking abortions, job training.

Under appropriations, Homeland Security, Interior, funding for the military quality of life and the Agriculture bill yesterday, plus the supplemental earlier in the year, a tremendous record of accomplishment that this Congress could be proud of on a bipartisan basis because most of those bills did pass with a significant number of Democratic votes.

## WITHDRAWING APPROVAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 27 is as follows:  
H.J. RES. 27

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress withdraws its approval, provided under section 101(a) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, of the WTO Agreement as defined in section 2(9) of that Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Pursuant to House Resolution 304, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 27, the joint resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the House considers the withdrawal of the United States from the World Trade Organization. I strongly oppose this resolution and urge my Members to join me in this opposition.

As a member of the World Trade Organization, the United States is one of 148 member countries. Our role in this global body is tremendously important, not only for the future of the United States trade but for the continuation of global trade liberalization.

As the world's leading economy, the largest economy that has ever been on the face of this earth, we all too often focus our attention on the aspects of trade we disagree with. When Members of Congress meet with our international counterparts, we spend a large amount of time discussing specific trade barriers and little time supporting the broad range of cooperation and successes that we may share.

Continued membership in the World Trade Organization will allow the United States the opportunity to continue cooperating as we work towards free trade benefiting United States consumers, farmers, manufacturers and firms.

Currently, the World Trade Organization is negotiating the Doha Round. Congress has been deeply involved with the administration as the Round continues to move forward. It is tremendously important that we remain active in these negotiations and push for a completed Doha.

Finally, I congratulate Mr. Pascal Lamy of France on his selection as the new World Trade Organization Director General. I am hopeful his abilities will enable the World Trade Organization to balance the concerns of its members. I look forward to working with him in the future.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is my strong view that the United States greatly benefits from our continued participation in the World Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by mentioning that this is a tripartisan resolution, and I want to thank our cosponsors: the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENBRENNER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI). I thank them very much for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any great illusions that this resolution will win today. When the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) offered it 5 years ago, it only received 56 votes. I hope, however, that as many Members as possible will vote for it today for one simple reason. It is time to send the Bush administration a message and a wake-up call that our current trade policies have failed and need to be completely rethought so that they represent the needs of the middle class and working families of our country and not just the CEOs of large corporations.

Mr. Speaker, international trade is a good thing, if implemented properly, but the evidence is overwhelming that our current trade policies, including NAFTA, including permanent normal trade relations with China, and the current roles of the WTO are not working for average Americans, they are not working for the environment, and they are not working for human rights. If we do not fundamentally change those policies, we can only expect more of the same.

The WTO was signed in 1995, and our current support of unfettered free trade has gone on for some 30 years. And what has been the result of those policies for the middle class of this country? Let us discuss it.

In a period in which technology has exploded, in a period in which worker productivity has significantly increased, we would think that the middle class would be better off.

□ 1030

But the economic reality today is that what every American knows is that the middle class of this country is collapsing. Poverty is increasing, and the gap between the rich and the poor is wider today than at any time since the 1920s. Are our disastrous trade policies the only reason for this? No. But they are an extremely important part of that equation, and that is for sure.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995 when the WTO was established, our trade deficit was \$96 billion. Today our trade deficit is a record-breaking \$617 billion and is on pace to become \$700 billion next year. Our trade deficit with China alone is \$162 billion.

Mr. Speaker, while some of my colleagues are going to extol all of the wonderful virtues of unfettered free trade, perhaps they can explain why in the last 4 years alone we have lost 2.8 million good-paying manufacturing jobs, one out of six in this country. One out of six in the last 4 years. In my own small State of Vermont, we have lost 20 percent of our manufacturing jobs in the last 5 years. Many people know

that General Motors has just announced they are going to lay off another 25,000 American workers. GM is producing cars in China, and there is some reason to fear that in 10 or 20 years, Detroit and automobile production in this country will be diminished as car manufacturing moves to China.

When my friends come up here and they tell us how great free trade is for our economy, I want them to explain why real inflation accounted for wages in the United States today is 7 percent lower than they were in 1973 for the bottom 90 percent of workers. And why is it that million of workers today in Vermont and throughout this country are forced to work two or three jobs just to keep their heads above water if free trade and globalization are all so great?

When my friends talk about the so-called robust economy that has been created, perhaps they can explain to us why 4 million more Americans now live in poverty than just 4 years ago, 4 million more Americans in poverty; and why incredibly there are 24,000 fewer private sector jobs now than when George Bush first took office. If our trade policies are so successful, how could we have experienced an unprecedented net loss of private sector jobs over the last 5 years? The only new net jobs that have been created by the Bush administration have been government jobs, 917,000 of them. Maybe the Republican Party is becoming the party of big government and creating government jobs, but certainly it has not been private sector jobs that free trade is supposed to create.

Today the gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider. The richest 1 percent of our population now own more wealth than the bottom 90 percent, and unfettered free trade has only made that worse. The gap between the rich and the poor more than doubled from 1979 to 2000. According to the Institute for International Economics, 39 percent of the increase in income equality is due to unfettered free trade.

Further and most ominously, if our present trade and economic policies continue, the likelihood is that the next generation will be the first in the modern history of the United States to have a lower standard of living than we do. According to a recent report from the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor statistics, over the next decade, seven out of the 10 fastest-growing occupations will be low-paying, low-skilled jobs that do not require a college education. Is that what free trade is giving to our kids, jobs at Wal-Mart, jobs at McDonald's, while the General Motors jobs, the General Electric jobs are going to China?

Mr. Speaker, it is not only blue collar jobs that we are on the cusp of losing. Millions of white collar information technology jobs are also on the line to go to China and India. Andy Grove, the founder of Intel, predicts that the United States will lose the bulk of its information technology to

jobs to China and India within the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line of this debate, and I want my friends to answer this, is that American workers should not be asked to compete against desperate people in China who make 30 cents an hour and who go to jail when they stand up for their political rights. That is not what we should be engaged in. The race to the bottom has been a disaster for the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first point out to those who may be following this debate why we are here today. I am sure people are wondering why we have a resolution on the floor that would withdraw us from the WTO and how that comes to the floor from a recommendation of the committee of jurisdiction that it be reported unfavorably, that is, that we vote against this resolution.

The reason we have this resolution before us is that 10 years ago we passed legislation to gain access to the WTO. At that time Bill Clinton was the President of the United States. Congressman Gingrich thought it was important that because the legislative branch of government is the branch responsible for trade that there be a review process every 5 years as to whether we should remain within the WTO, to give Congress the ability to exercise its constitutional responsibility to oversight and be responsible for trade. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I must tell the Members I had certain concerns as to why we would want to have basically a nuclear option in pulling out from the WTO.

Today, I am pleased that we can review the WTO because I think it is important for us to have a debate as to where we are in the WTO. I would suggest, though, we should have a more sophisticated review process than just to vote to withdraw from the WTO. As the ranking Democrat on the Trade Subcommittee working with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), we very much oppose this resolution and urge the rejection of the resolution. We believe it is in the interest of the United States to be in a rules-based trading system and to withdraw from a rules-based trading system would be folly, it would be wrong. Do we need to improve it? Yes, we do need to improve the WTO. Can we strengthen it? Yes, we need to strengthen it.

Quite frankly, I think that we should be working more aggressively with our trading partners to enforce our existing trade rules. When we see the manipulation of currency by China and we take no action against it, that is wrong. When we see other countries infringe on our intellectual property rights and we do not enforce our existing rules to make sure that we do not allow the stealing of our intellectual property rights, that is wrong. When we see Europe provide subsidies for ev-

everything from aircraft to agriculture products and we do not take efficient action against them, that is wrong. When we do not enforce our own antidumping laws which are permitted to be enforced to stop the surge of products into this country, that is wrong.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do think we need to strengthen these laws, but it would be wrong for us to withdraw. We want a rules-based system, but we want to strengthen that system.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, I think we should be spending more time talking about the Doha Round. That is the next stage of trying to move internationally under the WTO to expand opportunity for American manufacturers, farmers, and producers. The so-called Doha Development Agenda negotiations have reached a critical phase. It is generally agreed that in order to have a successful meeting of the ministers this December in Hong Kong, the members of the WTO will have to come to a significant level of agreement by July on three key areas.

First, agriculture. I must tell the Members I am concerned we have not made anywhere near the progress on agriculture that we need to do. I welcomed the announcement last week that the next director-general of the WTO will be Pascal Lamy, the former trade commissioner of EU, who comes from France. Obviously, Mr. Lamy will have a special burden to demonstrate that he can make progress in this area where the European Union has been so outrageous in its subsidies. We need to narrow that gap. We will wait to see whether, in fact, that can be accomplished.

The second area is in manufactured goods. There are two challenges here: tariff reductions particularly by the advanced developing countries and the elimination of the so-called nontariff barriers, the NTBs. And in both of these areas, much work remains to be done if we are going to have a successful Doha Round. I am particularly concerned about the negotiations on the NTBs which lie far behind at this time. This is a critical area for U.S. manufacturing, particularly in large markets such as Japan, Korea, and China.

And, finally, in the area of services, we are far behind where we should be in expanding opportunity for services by U.S. companies in other markets. I hope that our negotiators will be able to make up for lost time in the next couple of months so that an ambitious services package will be approved in Hong Kong.

There is one other area I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, as we review our participation in the WTO, and that is the dispute settlement system. The dispute settlement system is absolutely critical to a successful WTO. I must tell the Members I have major concerns as to how the dispute resolution system is working within the WTO. Under the old GATT system, silence in an agreement meant that a country could do what it deemed appropriate.

Under the decisions of the appellate body and the panels of the WTO, silence has been altered to mean that the appellate body and panels do what they think is appropriate. That is just wrong.

The number of cases are disturbing. In 33 cases brought against the United States since 1995, panels or the appellate body have overreached, overreached, in 22 of them. That is two-thirds. We need to have a way to review what the appellate body and dispute resolution panels are doing, and we are not doing that.

The consequences of this overreaching are clear. In 10 years the WTO has not affirmed a single safeguard measure as applied by the United States or any other country. In trade remedy cases involving the United States, anti-dumping duties, countervailing duty measures, and safeguard cases, the WTO has upheld the United States decision in two of 17 cases. That is an 88 percent loss ratio, clearly one that we need to take a better look at.

A growing number of observers are coming to recognize that the extraordinary loss rate is because the WTO panels and its appellate body do not respect the letter of the WTO agreements and are filling in the gaps beyond what the U.S. negotiators agreed to in the Uruguay Round.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this because this is another area that we have to make up for lost ground in our negotiations under the WTO. So make no mistake about it, we should reject this resolution overwhelmingly because it is in the interest of the United States to participate in a rules-based international trading system. I represent a community that includes the port of Baltimore. I want products coming into the United States. I also want products leaving the United States through the port of Baltimore. It is important for our economy. But we have to do a better job in our negotiations within the WTO, and that is what we need to concentrate on. That is what we need to work together on. And if we do that, it will be a win-win for this Nation. We will be able to increase jobs through manufacturing, through production, and through farming.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I first yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) for bringing this joint resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today because I believe that WTO membership has been a disaster for the U.S. worker. Since WTO, 1995, America's annual trade deficit grew from \$96 billion to \$617 billion. My home State of North Carolina has lost over 251,000

manufacturing jobs. The United States has lost over 2.9 million manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it was not too long ago that, I did not vote for it, but we gave trade promotion authority to the President of the United States. I was opposed to it when Mr. Clinton asked for it. I was opposed to it when Mr. Bush asked for it. And let me tell the Members what has happened since trade promotion authority, August of 2002.

□ 1045

North Carolina has lost over 52,000 manufacturing jobs, and the United States has lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs.

Let me take just a moment to talk about how WTO membership strips American sovereignty. If the United States does not change its laws to suit WTO, then America's businesses and consumers face trade sanctions. Trade disputes are decided by international panels that are hand-picked by the WTO. The identities of panel members are kept secret, and deliberations are kept confidential. These WTO panels have ruled in favor of the United States less than one-third of the time. They have ruled in favor of the United States less than one-third of the time.

WTO panel rulings go far beyond trade. In fact, the WTO panel recently found a Utah law prohibiting Internet gambling to be illegal. What will the WTO do next?

Let me quote from Robert Stumberg, a trade law expert at Georgetown University, from Business Week, March 7, 2005. I quote: "If Bush successfully engineers the introduction of private Social Security accounts, WTO rules would require the feds to let foreign money managers and insurers bid to manage them."

How far do we have to go before we give up the sovereignty of this Nation? I do not know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I think letting the Chinese manage American Social Security accounts is a bad idea. Unfortunately, under WTO, there is little we can do to prevent it. We have already outsourced 1.5 million jobs since 1989 to the Chinese. We do not need to give control over to the Chinese of Social Security accounts in America.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to make a real quick point. On my right, this chart shows on July 31, 2003, in North Carolina we lost 6,450 jobs. It says, "Five North Carolina plants close in the largest single job loss in the State's history." Just 3 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, a plant in my district announced that 445 jobs would be going overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking my colleagues that care about the American workers and care about the sovereignty of America to please join us in this effort.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our position to remove ourselves

from the WTO. My economic position is somewhat different from some of my allies, because I come at it from a free trade position.

I happen to believe in minimum tariffs, if any, but I do not believe that the process of the WTO and world government is a good way to do it. I do not think the WTO achieves its purpose, and I do not think it is permissible under the Constitution. Therefore, I strongly argue the case that, through the process, that we should defend the position of the Congress which gives us the responsibility of dealing with international trade, with international foreign commerce. That is our responsibility. We cannot transfer that responsibility to the President, and we cannot transfer that responsibility to an international government body.

Therefore, there are many of us who ally together to argue that case, although we may have a disagreement on how much tariffs we should have, because the Congress should decide that. We could have no tariffs; we could have a uniform tariff, which the Founders believed in and permitted; or we could have protective tariffs, which some of those individuals on our side defend, and I am not that much interested in. But the issue that unifies us is who should determine it. For me, the determination should be by the U.S. Congress and not to defer to an international government body.

Now this always bewilders me, when my conservative friends and those who believe in limited government are so anxious to deliver this to another giant international body. For instance, the WTO employs over 600 people. Free trade, if you are interested in free trade, all you have to do is write a sentence or two, and you can have free trade. You do not need 600 bureaucrats. It costs \$133 million to manage the WTO every year. Of course, we pay the biggest sum, over \$25 million for this, just to go and get permission or get our instructions from the WTO.

We all know that we raised taxes not too long ago, not because the American people rose up and called their Congressmen and said we wanted you to repeal this tax and change the taxes. It was done in order to be an upstanding member of the WTO. We responded and took instructions from the WTO and adapted our tax policy to what they desired.

One other issue that I think those who defend the WTO and call themselves free traders ought to recognize is that when we concede the fact that there should be a trade-off, it means they really do not believe in free trade. If you believe in free trade and the people have the right to spend their money the way they want, it would be as simple as that. It would benefit that country, because you could get your goods and services cheaper.

But this whole concession to the management of trade through the WTO says, all right, we are going to do this if you do this, and it acknowledges the

fact that free trade does not work unless you get something for it. That may be appealing to some, but a free trader should not argue that way. Because free trade, if it is a benefit, it is simply a benefit.

In the 1990s when the WTO was originally passed, the former Speaker of the House made a statement about this. I want to quote from him. This is from Newt Gingrich. He was talking about the WTO: "I am just saying that we need to be honest about the fact that we are transferring from the United States at a practical level significant authority to a new organization. This is a transformational moment. I would feel better if the people who favor this would be honest about the scale of change. This is not just another trade agreement. This is adopting something which twice, once in the 1940s and once in the 1950s, the U.S. Congress rejected. I am not even saying that we should reject it. I, in fact, lean toward it. But I think we have to be very careful, because it is a very big transfer of power."

I agree with Newt Gingrich on this. It was a huge transfer of power. I happen to believe it was an unconstitutional transfer of power; and, therefore, we are now suffering the consequences because we have lost prerogatives and control of our own trade policy.

Now the President of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, a free market think tank, from Auburn, Alabama said, "The World Trade Organization is supposed to be the great apparatus to push the world to greater economic integration. In reality, it was nothing but the resurrection of the old central planning fallacy that the world needs a central authority to manage it. The WTO has ended up politicizing trade by putting the stamp of officialdom on some very bad policy."

So my message is to appeal to those who believe in limited government, free markets, free trade and the Constitution. I appeal to those who want to use tariffs in a protective way because they defend the process. But I am really appealing to the conservatives who claim they believe in free trade, because I do not believe what we have here is truly free trade.

The WTO has already been able to influence our tax laws. Not too long ago, Utah repealed a ban on electronic gambling for fear the WTO would come in and find that violated free trade.

Another area of importance to so many of us, both on the left and the right of the political spectrum, has to do with the Codex Commission regulation set up by the United Nations. How much regulation are we going to have on vitamins and nutrition products? The UN already indicated the type of regulation. Guess who may, most likely, be the enforcer of these regulations? It will be the WTO. The Europeans have much stricter regulations. This means that some day the WTO may well come to us and regulate the distribution of vitamins and nutritional

supplements in this country, something that I do not think we should even contemplate. The case can be made that if they have already pressured us to do things, they may well do it once again.

Our administration is not too interested in the Kyoto Protocol, but that may well come down the road, and the enforcement of the Kyoto Protocol many believe will be enforced by the WTO.

So this is big government, pure and simple. It does not endorse free trade whatsoever. It endorses managed trade; and too often it is managed for the privileges of the very large, well-positioned companies. It does not recognize the basic principle that we should defend as a free society individuals ought to have the right to spend their money the way they want. That is what free trade is, and you can do that unilaterally without pain and suffering.

So I ask Members to consider, why should we not reclaim some of our prerogatives, our authorities, our responsibility? We have given up too much over the years. We have clearly given up our prerogatives on the declaration of war, and on monetary issues. That has been given away by the Congress. And here it is on the trade issue.

I can remember an ad put out in the 1990s when the WTO was being promoted and they talked directly, it was a full page ad, I believe, in the New York Times. They said, "This is the third leg of the new world order." We had the World Bank, we had the IMF, and now we had the World Trade Organization.

So if you are a believer in big government and world government and you believe in giving up the prerogatives of the Congress and not assuming our responsibility, I would say, go with the WTO. But if you believe in freedom, if you believe in the Constitution and if you really believe in free trade, I would say we should vote to get out of the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remaining time be allotted to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and that he be able to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of our country's participation in the World Trade Organization. Right now, it seems this resolution is destined for rejection. But addressing it today does give us a much-needed opportunity to focus on the WTO and how the U.S. can maximize its membership for the benefit of U.S. firms, workers and farmers.

The success of U.S. participation in the WTO should be measured by our ability to liberalize markets and set fair trade rules for all WTO Members. Clearly, the United States has benefited greatly from its WTO membership and plays a leading role in shaping the way the world trades today.

Since the creation of the WTO, U.S. exports and overall trade have expanded significantly, with a \$283 billion or 64 percent increase in U.S. manufacturing exports; a \$139 billion or a 70 percent increase in U.S. services exports; and an \$18 billion or 39 percent increase in U.S. agricultural exports.

Once WTO agreements are set and commitments are made, however, it is crucial that the U.S. ensure that the countries involved live up to their part of the deal. This is where we have fallen short.

Here, the U.S. has several concerns, such as China's failure to follow through with its commitments to ensure that domestic and foreign firms can distribute products within that country as of December 2004; many countries have failed to meet their TRIPS commitments and have not effectively enforced intellectual property rights and the protection of data privacy; there is concern regarding the establishment of standards, licensing and customs barriers, including the EU's customs procedures and its proposed new chemical regulations; and there is concern about the continued proliferation of many agricultural barriers, such as the unscientific barriers to many agricultural products in Europe, China and elsewhere.

The United States should continue to insist that all WTO members implement the WTO agreements in a timely and comprehensive manner.

Like many of my colleagues, I hope the WTO will successfully conclude the Doha Development Round and continue to contribute to the dynamic global marketplace as a growth engine for WTO member economies.

However, in the Doha Development Round, many developing countries expressed concerns regarding implementation of some commitments, and they have sought extensions and delays. Here, technical assistance and support for capacity building are critical tools needed to advance implementation goals.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the Congress to ensure that the U.S. provides technical support and capacity building measures to assist developing countries in meeting their WTO commitments.

□ 1100

If trade is to be a tool of development and growth for our developing-country trading partners, we must play a central role in helping the WTO facilitate compliance with member obligations. I stress this today because I want our new USTR Ambassador Portman to know that this is and should always be



a priority for the United States at the World Trade Organization.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. A lot of astounding remarks have been made since I stood up here and introduced this resolution, in the negative. There are a couple of things I think we need to really talk about.

What has been the economic growth of the United States? How fast is our economy growing? It is growing at the rate of 4 percent. How fast is the economy in Europe growing? It is 1 percent. How fast is the European economy growing? It is 1 percent. The China economy is growing at 9 percent, but let us look at what that means. Nine percent of the Chinese economy is less than 4 percent of our economy. So I can say with all certainty that we have, in terms of dollars, the fastest growing economy in the world. No question about that.

And of this economy, what percentage is exports? It is 25 percent. Are we not concerned about those jobs? And when we talk about the loss of jobs in the United States, we are not talking about a net loss; we are talking about, yes, there has been some loss of jobs and, yes, a lot of these jobs have been because of foreign competition, yes. But our economy has grown in other areas, so it has also created jobs. If we look at just the jobless rate of where we are now and where we were a few years ago, we are doing pretty darn good. If we look at the world economy, we are doing really good.

So why would we want to send a message to the administration by attempting to throw the world economy into chaos? It makes absolutely, absolutely no sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I want to associate myself with his remarks, and I appreciate his leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution calling for the U.S. withdrawal from the World Trade Organization.

The WTO is the most important international organization that governs world trade. Decisions are made by the member countries. The WTO has 148 members and 31 observer governments, many of those, most of those are applicants for membership. Its members represent over 95 percent of world trade. Trade agreements administered by the WTO cover a broad range of goods and services trade and apply to virtually all government practices that directly relate to trade; for example, tariffs, subsidies, government procurement, and trade-related intellectual property rights.

U.S. membership and leadership in the World Trade Organization is essential. It is definitely in our national and our political and our economic interests to continue to be a member. Our membership translates into real eco-

nommic growth in this country, as the gentleman from Florida very correctly said. During the 10 years of U.S. participation in the WTO, international trade and investment have been important forces driving our impressive economic growth. Over that period, trade accounted for one-quarter of all U.S. economic growth and supported an estimated 12 million jobs. Furthermore, trade promotes economic competition, which keeps inflation low.

Now, let me take just one moment to rebut an all-too-often made allegation against U.S. membership in the WTO, namely, that membership is a violation of U.S. sovereignty and the U.S. Constitution. WTO dispute panels cannot overturn or change U.S. Federal, State, or local laws. They have no authority to change a U.S. law or to require the United States or any State or local government to change its laws or decisions. Only the Federal or State governments can change a Federal or State law.

If a U.S. law is inconsistent with the WTO, our trading partners may withdraw trade benefits of equivalent effect. However, under trade agreement rules, the United States retains complete sovereignty in its decision of how to respond to any panel decision against it. That was made abundantly clear the last several years as Congress grappled with changes to our corporate tax structures for foreign sales corporations, or FSC, to accommodate commitments we have made to our trading partners. Only Congress could make those changes to the law as we grapple, and we grappled, with that.

Those who falsely portray the WTO as a violation of U.S. sovereignty are ones who simply want an unfettered ability to preserve or create more protectionism.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and to continue the U.S. membership in the World Trade Organization.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the economic disaster wrought by a radical free trade policy on the working people of America is well documented, but I am going to focus on another aspect of this WTO agreement that the previous gentleman spoke about. He said that the secretive dispute resolution panel, which has no conflict-of-interest rules, does not allow outside interveners, only allows the two representative governments into the room, and deliberates secretly and comes up with a binding, a binding, decision and cannot change U.S. laws.

Now, I raised this issue with the Clinton administration when they negotiated this misbegotten agreement; and I said, How can you enter us into an agreement where secretive panels can preempt our laws? They said, oh, you do not understand, you are wrong, just like the gentleman before me. Yes, it is technically true, they cannot reach

into the United States and change a law. We can, if they find our rule to be non-WTO compliant, which they have more than 90 percent of the time when complaints are brought against the United States of America, we have an option. We can repeal the law, or we can pay a fine to keep it, a huge fine, in many cases. So environmental protection, consumer protection, buy America, buy Oregon, buy your State, all of those things, we can have those laws. That is right. He is technically right. We just have to pay massive penalties to foreign governments to keep them.

This is an extraordinary undermining of the sovereignty of the United States of America and the interests of the American people. This is not about free trade; this is about corporate-managed trade through a secretive body which is dominated by those very same corporations and many dictatorial governments around the world; and the U.S. is bound by their secretive decisions. This is absolutely outrageous.

To date, the WTO has ruled U.S. policies illegal 42 out of 48 cases, 85.7 percent that has been brought against us. They ruled illegal regulation issued under the Clean Air Act; the United States Tax Code; laws to protect companies from unfair dumping or subsidized foreign products, among others. And it is true. We can keep those laws if we are willing to pay massive fines to keep them.

Now, what kind of sovereignty is that? Next in their sights are buy America laws, those referenced by the gentleman from the Carolinas. What he said is he does not want to see a Social Security program administered from China. Now, people would have thought that was a weird thing to say. No. The WTO requires we cannot discriminate in terms of who the vendors will be. In fact, homeland security can be provided by the Chinese, or maybe even by Iran, under the rules of the WTO. Will that not be just peachy?

This is an extraordinarily radical agreement which we do not need. The U.S. did just fine as the greatest trading Nation in the world with bilateral agreements. We can go back to that system, and we can do better than we are doing under this so-called rules-based system.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, just one moment, I think, to respond to the gentleman who was just in the well, and that is in the 10 years that we have been members of the World Trade Organization, our environmental laws have never been challenged, have never been challenged, nor will they.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the former ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Trade, one of the senior members of the committee on Ways and Means.



(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposal that we withdraw from the WTO. I urge that we look at this basic question: on balance, would we be better off if there were not a WTO? And I think the answer to that is we would not be.

Expanded trade has occurred in this country and in this world. It is not a win-win proposition, as some people like to say. There are losers as well as winners, both individually and in nations. It is not an easy proposition, expanded trade. However, globalization is here to stay. There is no turning back the clock. The question is to try to make the hands tick well and in the right direction.

There has been some argument about sovereignty. It is not true that WTO decisions do not impact U.S. laws. That is not true. I supported the GATT agreement; I helped to shape the implementation language. Did it have some impact on U.S. laws? Yes. Were there some requirements that U.S. laws be changed? Yes. By definition, tariff agreements require changes in laws here and everywhere else, unless they are decreed by edict. The WTO changed from GATT, and so now there is a final dispute settlement mechanism. I think on balance that was a good idea because, otherwise, every country could veto, and that was not workable.

But we have to look at the problems as well as the promise, the problems as well as the achievements.

The dispute settlement system is flawed. The answer is not to withdraw from the WTO; it is to work hard to change the dispute settlement system. As was said earlier, it is very opaque, that is true. There is not an openness that there should be; and when it comes to our safeguard provisions that many of us worked hard to put into law, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), who is the ranking member, was part and parcel of that, as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and those on the Republican side, we worked hard to put safeguards in. Every challenge to safeguards has been upheld by the WTO. We have lost every case. We have not known what went into the consideration of the decision fully, we did not see all the briefs, and we did not know the basis for the decisions, in many cases. In some cases they went beyond the language of the WTO agreements.

A Wall Street Journal article earlier this month had this statement about panelists: "They don't have time to develop expertise and procedural and technical aspects of the dispute settlement system." And we are going to have them judge the Boeing, the complicated Boeing case, for example? We need to change, and work harder to change, the dispute settlement system, not to withdraw from the WTO.

So there are some major structural problems.

Also, relating to China, I have been very dissatisfied with the way the WTO has handled the annual review of China's obligations that we worked so hard to bring about. Part of the problem is with the WTO in Geneva, part of the problem has been our administration that has not vigorously, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has worked so hard to illustrate this, the administration has not worked actively enough to get China to live up to its agreements. So more needs to be done by the administration, and we have been losing too many cases, and we have been filing too few cases.

So my suggestion is that we focus today on the accomplishments, but also the barriers, to effective operation of the WTO.

□ 1115

One issue the WTO has totally failed to address relates to core labor standards. On environment, they have kind of a group that looks at environmental issues.

On core labor standards, there has been resistance to address this. Years ago, there was a proposal by the Clinton administration to set up a working group within the WTO. That was resisted, resisted by many, including developing nations.

I think now, as developing nations have to compete with each other, including China, where labor standards essentially are nonexistent, those developing nations are beginning to say, well, maybe the WTO should address it. But it has not.

The argument was, okay, let us use bilateral agreements as building blocks in a number of areas, including core labor standards. And that is why I want to say just a few words now about the failure of this administration to use bilateral agreements effectively as a building block when it comes to basic core labor standards, the ILO labor standards, child labor, forced labor, nondiscrimination, and the right of workers to assemble, to organize, to have unions if they desire, and to bargain collectively.

CAFTA is a vital agreement in terms of where globalization is going. In Latin America, there is growing unrest and changes in government, in part because of the failure to have the large numbers of people, the largest proportion of people, share in the benefits of globalization.

So what did this administration do under these circumstances? It negotiates a standard, enforce your own laws. Enforce your own laws is only used as to core labor standards, not as to intellectual property or tariffs or anything else. And the tragedy of it is that the laws in Central America, to some extent the Dominican Republic, do not meet the basic standards giving people the freedom in the labor market. That is the basic fact. The ILO reports say so, despite what the administration tries to say. Their own State Department reports say that, despite

what the administration and our new USTR, Mr. Portman, said this morning.

What is at stake is the development of a middle class that is so critical. And I am going to say more about this later today. The experience in countries is that workers are a critical part of the evolution towards a strong middle class.

There was a reference by Mr. PORTMAN to Jordan. And what he said, that CAFTA is stronger than Jordan, it is simply not true. It is not correct. Jordan has reference in its agreement to the core labor standards, that is not true of CAFTA. And the enforcement capability in Jordan was left to each country to undertake.

So I just wanted to comment on this, because the bilateral agreements were supposed to be a building block where the WTO did not address an issue; and there is a failure at this critical point of globalization, a critical missed opportunity in terms of helping the benefits of globalization being widely shared.

I want to close, and I will say more about this later today, why it matters to the U.S. It matters in terms of Central America, which, as I say, has such income disparities that are true of Latin America generally.

What it means is, as to Central America, if workers are not going to be able to participate, to have freedom, to be able to associate, to become a part of the workplace, and are going to remain in poverty, it is bad for those workers, it is bad for those countries that desperately need a middle class, it is bad for our workers who will not compete with countries where workers are suppressed, and it is bad for our companies if there is no strong middle class to purchase our products.

So I am deeply disappointed by this effort to skirt this basic issue at this important time. A building block? No, CAFTA moves backwards from the present status instead of moving forward. And this notion that we are going to give more money to our Labor Department to enforce the laws, when they are cutting the budget, this Congress and the administration, are cutting these moneys for ILAB and other parts of the Labor Department. You cannot pour money to enforce inadequate laws and have it work out well.

So, in a word, what we need is a trade policy built on a bipartisan foundation, which is not true today. What we need is a trade policy that helps move globalization forward, that makes sure that more and more people share in the benefits of globalization. Pulling out of the WTO is not going to accomplish that. Instead, we need to work together to make the WTO more responsive in all respects and also to make sure that our bilateral agreements meet the challenges that the WTO is not meeting today. On the latter, this administration continues to fail.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, so that no one listening to this debate is confused,

this vote has nothing to do with DR-CAFTA, it has nothing to do with free trade, it is simply are we going to continue as part of the World Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) on that clarification, because I find it kind of ironic, the fact that we are on a fundamental question, should the United States continue to belong to the World Trade Organization or not, complaining about degrees of differences in various pieces of trade legislation.

That is, in fact, how we got here in the first place. Prior to World War II, in fact, many historians argue the reason we got into the Great Depression as deeply as we did is because the United States chose to throw up significant tariffs and barriers to commercial interaction among nations.

Following World War II, there was an agreement that we should not do that again; and we created a rather imperfect agreement called the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It was as good as we could get at the time. As we continued to operate under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with so-called rounds named after various cities, which has become a tradition now, the Uruguay Round, the Tokyo Round, the Rome Round, we decided that we need to move to another level, a higher level of integration and coordination; and that became the World Trade Organization.

The United States was somewhat frustrated, one, in our dispute resolution mechanism, and the problem was we were winning with no substantive result in those disputes. We thought we needed a better dispute resolution mechanism.

Marginally, the one we have today, I believe is better. Is it good? Not yet. As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) indicated, I think there needs to be a much higher degree of transparency, especially on the resources used to research decisions. That will be an ongoing point of discussion.

But what is good primarily I think for the United States and the World Trade Organization restructure from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is that agriculture became one of the points of discussion and importantly for the U.S. services and financial instruments and in the protection of intellectual property rights. Those were critical. These were, in essence, new additions; and we are continuing to try to expand those areas that countries sit down and discuss under a structure.

The decision today is, should that imperfect structure remain and we continue to work toward a better struc-

ture or should we simply withdraw? That really is not a difficult decision for most Members; and, overwhelmingly, we will agree to stay in the World Trade Organization when we vote on this particular measure.

But what you are hearing primarily are complaints and concerns that we have about the ongoing world trade relationship; and, heaven knows, I can wheel out all of my arguments as well. But, as correctly pointed out by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), this is narrowly on the WTO issue.

But let me just select a couple of areas of trade action by the United States in the last several years.

First of all, under the Constitution, all trade-related activity with foreign countries is constitutionally the responsibility of Congress.

Now how many trade agreements do you think we would reach if we went to a country and said, come on in, negotiate with the House and the Senate, wait until we go through a conference committee in deciding what that agreement is going to be, and you ought to agree ahead of time before you see the final product?

Now, obviously, that led to a desire to restrain the responsibility but provide the administration the ability to do the negotiating nation to nation. We are currently under the trade promotion authority structure. Can you imagine the World Trade Organization where every country has a veto, you can only to things by unanimous agreement, and how rapidly you can advance concerns that you have when the primary criteria is unanimity?

So one of the reasons we continue to use bilateral country-to-country relationships and regional agreements, in part, so that we do not get bogged down by waiting for the WTO, but also to a certain extent, since we believe in transparency, since this country is the most open large country of trade, import, export, of any in the world, that open markets all over the world are good.

So when you examine a bilateral agreement, for example, like the United States and Singapore, Singapore obviously is not too worried about agricultural product protection. They are worried about intellectual property rights. They are worried about services.

We were able to enter into an agreement with Singapore, the United States and Singapore, to set a mark for other countries on what is the best way to deal with those particular concerns; and that is down now as an agreement which we can point to as a model that we should move forward on dealing with other countries.

A regional agreement would be the Central American Free Trade Agreement, and what is left out of the discussion with CAFTA are just a couple of points I would like to mention.

One, before we decided to deal with the region, we told those countries, initially the five Central American coun-

tries, they had to deal with each other. That El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, et cetera, all had to come together as a region, which, first of all, is fundamentally significant. They are not looking at themselves as individuals. The final question was an individual one, but they looked at themselves as a region. Once they did that, we then entered into trade negotiations with them.

You need to know something about those trade relations. They were not driven by the Central American countries' desire to get into the U.S. marketplace. Normally, we can say an opportunity to get into the U.S. marketplace is a pretty good club in which we can get them to agree to various things we want them to agree to. Obviously, it is voluntary on both sides, but the incentive of getting into the U.S. market is a terrific reason to push the agreement probably farther than they would want, because the reward is getting into the U.S. market.

Not the case in Central America. We gave away the U.S. market for security, humanitarian reasons. Their products come into the United States tariff free already. If there is no CAFTA, their products still come into the U.S. market virtually tariff free.

Basically, what we are trying to do is open up the Central American market to U.S. goods and services where they have high tariffs. And when you negotiate freely, one of the things you cannot do is dictate to other people what it is that they are going to do internally in their country. You can set standards, you can cajole, you can create a mutual growth structure, you can bring money to the table to assist them in moving forward. That is basically what the United States does with the rest of the world on bilateral and regional agreements.

□ 1130

And the CAFTA agreement is good for the United States in terms of the economics of getting into the Central American marketplace so that we have a little more of a level playing field with other countries around the world. But it also is a chance for these fledgling and growing democracies to have the input of knowledge, training, and financial assistance in growing their responsible labor structure as well.

Most of this is tinted with "protect America" as the argument. America does not really need protection. America needs the opening of markets around the world in voluntary structures whether they be bilateral, regional, or multinational, as the WTO is. There will always be resistance. China coming into the WTO was a good thing. Are we having difficulties with them? Yes. Will they continue to have difficulties with themselves as they advance as the world's largest nation? Yes. But those discussions occur under a framework which over time has gotten better and will get better, especially with the United States leadership.

For the United States to walk away unilaterally from what is the best historical example of nations dealing economically in a meaningful and useful way makes no sense whatsoever. And that is why overwhelmingly the vote today will be "no" on withdrawing from the WTO. Does that resolve any of the ongoing difficulties we have in terms of our perception of the world, how fair the world is, how open markets in the world are, what instruments we need to use to try to push a more transparent and open marketplace, between countries, among countries, and in fact in all trading nations of the world? Of course not.

All of those issues will continue to be before us, but they will be before us in a structure which allows us to measure, allows us to judge, and most importantly allows us to change as the key competitive component between nations of the world today and tomorrow will be the question of trade. And ordered and structured competition is to the advantage of the United States. And that is why overwhelmingly you will see support staying in the WTO, nurturing and growing the WTO, notwithstanding the fact that we have a whole lot of concerns about a whole lot of issues.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has 38 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I could hardly believe my ears to hear one of my colleagues say that America does not need protection from the WTO. We have lost almost 3 million manufacturing jobs. Tell that to those millions of families who have seen their lives destroyed by this trade structure which is based, inherently based, on inequality.

We have a \$617 billion trade deficit. America does not need protection?

We have workers who are struggling to save their homes; but these trade agreements are causing jobs to be moved out and people do not have the opportunity to save their homes.

I have been all over this country, and I have seen padlocks on gates and grass growing in parking lots where they used to make steel, where they used to make cars, where they used to washing machines, where they used to make bicycles. America does not need protection?

Yes, it is time for us to get out of the WTO because the WTO has set the stage for a driving down of the quality of life in this country. Everyone in this House knows that we cannot write into our laws that workers' rights must be regarded, let us say, in China. I want someone here to contradict that be-

cause if we put that China must have the right to organize in any of their conduct of commerce in their country, that would be ruled WTO illegal and the United States would be subject to a fine or sanctions by the WTO just for standing up for workers' rights.

There is a moral imperative here, and that imperative is as old as this country. But it is also consistent with basic Christian morality, and may I quote from a Papal Encyclical, Leo XIII, 1891 in *Rerum Novarum* said, "Let the working man and the employer make free agreement and in particular let them agree freely as to wages. Nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, that wages ought not be insufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage earner if through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better. He is made a victim of force and injustice."

I maintain that the WTO helps to keep in place a structure of force and injustice against workers because we in this country cannot pass laws that would lift the yoke of this force and injustice off workers anywhere in the world because the WTO does not permit, does not permit any type of workers' rights to be included or to be regarded. They are WTO illegal. We cannot pass workers' rights and put them in our trade agreements.

Another Papal Encyclical from Pope Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*: "But it is unfortunate that on these new conditions of society, a system has been constructed which considers profit as the key motive for economic progress, competition as the supreme law of economics, and private ownership with the means of production as an absolute right that has no limits and carries no corresponding social obligation." He goes on to say that "this leads to a dictatorship rightly denounced by Pious XI by producing the international imperialism of money."

There is a moral imperative here that we have to recognize that we need trade agreements that have workers' rights, human rights, and environmental quality principles; and we cannot have that with the WTO. It is time to get out of the WTO and set up a trade structure based on those principles.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I agree with my colleague that we should be negotiating higher labor standards, at least international labor standards; but I would suggest the way to do that is engagement, not to pull out of the WTO and to do better in our bilateral agreements. I agree with him on CAFTA and to elevate the WTO to do better on international standards.

The withdrawal would leave these countries without any opportunity to improve labor standards.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the pull-out of the U.S. of the WTO. This is a global economy that we live in. We have got to be at the table to work with the companies and work with the countries that are taking our jobs, and I believe the pull-out is the wrong thing to do.

Should it be strengthened? Yes, it should and the administration should reject all principles that would make our trade laws weaker. If we talk about intellectual property rights, we need to enforce those that are in there. And the Bush administration and our U.S. administration, regardless of who sits in that White House, must make sure that those property rights are enforced internationally, and that is what the WTO should be about.

In 1995 when the WTO was established, I thought then and I do hope now that dispute resolution procedures would be those where we could come to the table to resolve some of those disputes. The dispute process has become too cumbersome, too lengthy; and many times we find our companies, U.S. companies, not taking advantage and being very much put out of business.

The steel industries in my district, too much dumping from some other countries into America. We ought to rectify that so that U.S. companies can take U.S. companies and that we be able to employ our citizens.

Too many dislocated workers, the only way to address this is to stay in the WTO to work with the other countries. And our administration must see that our rules, our trade laws, our employees' rights are saved. We want to upgrade and lift up other countries, but we must save America.

America is in crisis. Our workers, too many have lost their jobs and many more to come. I represent General Motors, and this week they announced the closing of more plants, dislocating more workers and at the same time put \$2 billion in China last year.

So I say stay in the WTO; make it better. This is a world economy, and the U.S. is the most powerful. I would hope that as we move forward in this discussion, and I know the vote will be overwhelming that we stay, that we build it and that we make sure that the countries that are taking our jobs have a responsibility to the workers of this country.

However Members intend to vote on the resolution before us, the issue of trade remedies under the rules established by the World Trade Organization (WTO) is of paramount concern to the industries of my district in the years ahead. How we address this issue will be an important factor in determining whether we can retain support for open markets and the international trading system as we know it.

Countries like China, Japan, and India that have most consistently dumped in this market

and violated international rules are pushed hard to have those disciplines eviscerated. That would be a disaster for U.S. manufacturers, agricultural producers and workers.

Anti-dumping and anti-subsidy laws have already been critically weakened as a result of groundless WTO dispute resolution decisions. If we see yet another new trade agreement that limits the use of these laws, I am afraid they will become completely ineffective.

Our trading partners, in the name of free trade, have been effective in putting forward a number of specific proposals that are designed to weaken U.S. trade laws. Congress is on record as opposing these efforts and I welcome this opportunity to advocate that our top priority should be to preserve core trade disciplines. However, our trade negotiators have not offered meaningful proposals to challenge those who would weaken our trade remedy laws. This is a recipe for failure.

If the Administration comes back with an agreement that waters down our trade remedy laws even further, I am confident we will see a strong backlash in Congress—and a major effect on support for any new trade agreements.

Support for the WTO cannot be taken for granted in Congress or in this country if we cannot maintain the assurance that unfair trade can and will be remedied. I urge the Administration to focus on this issue and to reject any WTO deal that would weaken U.S. trade remedy laws. Otherwise, we may well see the next WTO vote have a very different outcome than is likely today.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1994 I supported the establishment of the WTO. I supported the establishment of it because the creation of the WTO was supposed to lower trade barriers. The WTO was supposed to include developed and developing countries, and environmental and labor standards were expected to rise for all.

The WTO was created with the assumption that the rules would be applied fairly to all. Today, I am voting against the WTO because it has failed to deliver on any of its promises. The WTO was created by sovereign nations to create a true international trade community, but today the WTO is manipulated by multinational corporations with a loyalty to nothing but their bottom line. These multilaterals are patronizing, not patriotic. They treat human labor as nothing more than disposable machinery. The only discernable labor standard under the WTO is exploitation.

Under the WTO there are two environmental standards, pollute and to spoil. Moreover, there is no transparency at the WTO. Who is in charge?

The WTO is grossly prejudiced against U.S. interests. As one of my colleagues mentioned earlier today, the U.S. has lost 42 of 48 cases.

I am proud to be an American citizen. I understand, however, that the United States is not always right. But only 12½ percent of the time?

Worse, the WTO struck down steel safeguards that were put in place after record levels of illegal steel dumping caused more than 40 steel companies into bankruptcy and more than 50,000 steel workers to lose their jobs.

In 1994, the last full year before the WTO came into existence, the United States had a trade deficit, unfortunately, of about \$150 billion. During 2004 the U.S. trade deficit hit an all-time high of \$650 billion, an increase of 333 percent. We have clearly benefited under the WTO.

A more frightening figure is that the U.S. trade deficit last year with China alone was more than our trade deficit was with the entire world the year before the WTO was created. As we debate this resolution today, we will borrow an additional \$1.7 billion in these 24 hours for our children to pay off for the rest of their lives just to finance the trade deficit we are accumulating today under the wanted WTO.

I appreciate my colleague from Vermont for bringing this resolution to the floor. I support it and ask my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman in the well that of the 50 cases we have brought before the World Trade Organization, we have won 46 which is a 92 percent success rate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1145

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good debate. It is a good, healthy debate that we are having here on the floor of Congress.

The earlier speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, cited some papal encyclicals, but, as a practicing Catholic, I will be the first to defend his right to do that here on the floor, but I also think there are some bigger issues we need to talk about.

First of all, how do we keep jobs in America? We all care about that. This is what we are talking about. I would argue we have got to do basically two things: stop pushing jobs overseas and stop countries from unfairly taking jobs overseas.

How do we stop pushing jobs overseas? Well, for starters, we can address health care costs. We can address the fact that we tax our businesses and our jobs more than any other country in the world, save Japan. We can address tort costs, regulatory costs, have a comprehensive energy policy to make energy more affordable.

How do we stop countries from unfairly taking jobs overseas? We have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that 97 percent of the world's consumers are not in this country. They are outside of this country. One in five manufacturing jobs are tied to exports. Exports, on average, pay more than other

jobs. We cannot put our head in the sand. Pulling out of the WTO is the economic equivalent of throwing the baby out with the bath water.

What has happened since we have gone into the WTO? Let us look at the challenges that confront us.

We talk about China, a very appropriate topic to discuss here. Since China joined the WTO, do my colleagues know how many laws we had to change and pass in America to go there? Zero. Do my colleagues know how many laws China had to change, laws and regulations, to enter the WTO? 1,100. To get into the WTO, to join countries of fair trade, China had to change 1,100 laws. Are they following all these rules and agreements? Of course not. But because they are in the WTO, because we have the WTO, we finally have a forum, a mechanism, a system to bring these countries into compliance to play by the rules. If we did not have this system, all these countries could play by whatever rules they set.

We are the economic superpower of the world. We play by the rules. We are the most transparent, most honest, most basic system in the world. We need other countries to play by the same rules, too, so we can all join together in growing economic growth here in America and across the world. Pulling out of the WTO would be the economic equivalent of biting off our nose to spite our face.

Since we have had China in the WTO, I have been critical of the administration's stance in its first 3 years. I have joined with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle criticizing the administration on their China policy. However, over the past year and a half, the administration, through the WTO rules, has brought 12 different actions against China.

We are making success. We are bringing accountability. Pull out now, and the situation gets much worse. Stay in it. Fight for fair trade. We can clean up these rules, and that is the only way to bring other nations into the fair trade arena.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend mentioned what has happened since China has joined the WTO. I think he has neglected to mention that our trade deficit with China has soared, that millions of jobs have left the United States to go to China.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 27 to withdraw the United States from the World Trade Organization.

The WTO is not about free trade or fair trade. It is about corporate power. WTO rules allow America's labor, environmental and public interest laws to be challenged by multinational corporations seeking profits and power. Other countries have also seen their domestic laws challenged in order to

expand corporate power. The WTO sacrifices the rights of workers, the protection of the environment and the health and safety of working families.

WTO rules support corporations to move their operations from one country to another in search of the cheapest labor and the least government regulation. If a country enacts a minimum wage law, a corporation that does not want to pay a decent wage can simply move its factory to another country. If workers in that country organize a labor union, the corporation can move the factory to a third country. Many corporations prefer to operate in countries such as the People's Republic of China, which outlaw independent labor organizations. The WTO has no restrictions on sweatshops, child labor, prison labor or slave labor.

WTO rules promote investment opportunities for multinational corporations without regard to their impact on workers, the environment or the public interest. Countries' labor, health and environmental laws can be challenged if they have a side effect of restricting trade.

In the 10 years since the WTO was established, a wide variety of U.S. and foreign laws have been challenged. With only two exceptions, every health, food safety and environmental law challenged at the WTO has been ruled illegal. Meanwhile, multinational pharmaceutical companies have used WTO intellectual property rules to deny poor countries the right to provide live-saving medicine to people with terrible diseases like HIV and AIDS.

They tried it with Brazil. The world protest against the attempt to keep Brazil from using generic drugs to save lives, prevent HIV and AIDS was fought off because of the protest, and they had to back down.

But look what they did in South Africa. I wish I had time to tell my colleagues about it.

In 42 out of the 48 completed cases brought against the United States, the WTO has labeled U.S. laws illegal. U.S. laws ruled illegal by WTO include tax laws, anti-dumping laws, sea turtle protections and clean air rules. And when the WTO ruled in favor of the United States in a case on bananas, it was to benefit who? A large corporation, Chiquita, that has now driven Grenada and some of these small countries into poverty. We do not produce any bananas here in the United States. We protected Chiquita, who mistreats its workers in Central America, and we put small Caribbean farmers out of work.

Mr. Speaker, after the WTO rules a country's laws illegal, the WTO authorizes economic sanctions that cost the country millions of dollars. These sanctions put small businesses out of business and workers out of work. History has proven that the WTO does not prevent trade wars. It authorizes trade wars.

The WTO puts profits of the world's wealthiest and most powerful corpora-

tions ahead of the health, safety and welfare and well-being of working families.

I urge my colleagues to support the WTO Withdrawal Resolution. It's time to stop the global expansion of corporate power and put working families first.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reject any attempts to withdraw the United States from the WTO and vote no on final passage.

When instituted correctly and fairly, trade agreements open up foreign markets to U.S. goods, create new opportunities for companies and their employees, and lift the standard of living for people in the country with whom we are trading. Economists estimate that cutting trade barriers in agriculture, manufacturing and services by one-third would boost the world economy by \$613 billion, equivalent to adding an economy the size of Canada to the world economy. The WTO is needed to monitor this process and ensure a level playing field.

However, in certain cases, there is not a level playing field. A great example of this is Airbus. Airbus is currently the world's leading manufacturer of civil aircraft, with about 50 percent of global market share. Airbus received approximately \$30 billion in market-distorting subsidies from the European governments, including launch aid, infrastructure support, debt forgiveness, equity infusions, and research and development funding.

These subsidies, in particular launch aid, have lowered Airbus' development costs and shifted the risk of aircraft development to European governments, and thereby enabled Airbus to develop aircraft at an accelerated pace and sell these aircraft at prices and on terms that would otherwise be unsustainable. These unfair actions put Boeing at a major disadvantage and leads to a negative impact to workers and businesses in this country. By most conservative estimates, the unfair subsidies that Airbus receives have led the United States to losing at least 60,000 high-paying jobs.

As a member of the House Committee on International Relations and the fact that John F. Kennedy International Airport is the economic engine of my district, it is imperative that this body support USTR Ambassador Robert Portman's efforts to have a WTO dispute resolution panel put an end to the unfair subsidies to Airbus.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire again as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has 27 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is with a combination of perhaps resignation and frustration with which I stand here.

Will Rogers once said, in explaining the length of a political platform, that it takes a lot of words to straddle an issue, and I have every intention of using a lot of words here this morning.

I think, like many people, like most of us, we have no fear of free trade, that the United States, playing on a level playing field, can easily compete in the world market, and I do not ascribe to some of the statements that I think have been somewhat overzealous or vitriolic in describing policies here. I also agree that in some respects moving out of the policy we have right now without a substantial alternative would be chaotic. Having said that, this is where the "but" comes in.

I intend on either giving a symbolic vote or maybe a symbolic speech in place of that vote with concerns of sovereignty issues that are dealt with here and that some of those voices that are concerned about sovereignty issues are not just simply those fearful of the dark but there are legitimate concerns which require a periodic reanalysis of what we are doing.

I speak specifically about a case which has sent the Attorney General from the State of Utah to join 28 Attorney Generals from other States in protest of the situation in which the World Trade Organization has thrown State statutes in jeopardy.

Antigua, with which we had a policy dating back to 1993, has complained that laws prohibiting Internet gambling as well as gambling and betting paraphernalia, which have been for about 100 years the social policy of Utah, violate trade organizations; and the trade organization ruled in favor of Antigua.

It is inherently wrong for any adjudicative panel of any organization, internationally or trade, to put in jeopardy the kinds of State laws that we have in place, especially when they deal with social policies that have been there for almost 100 years. Whether this is simply a glitch in negotiations that can easily be worked out or whether this is a systemic problem or whether, as the Attorney Generals are arguing, that the States need a greater voice in the organization and the application of these trade policies, especially if it is going to relate to State law, that is the discussion that needs to take place.

My State may have lucked out because a clerical error in this particular case did not refer specifically to the Utah State law; and, therefore, it may not be applicable. But the fear factor is still there, that in the future State efforts, State regulations and State policies may be put in jeopardy not only by our trade policies but also by Federal regulations that affect those trade

policies when they ought not to be. That is the issue that needs to be periodically addressed.

I recognize that this particular resolution is very narrow in its application. It may not be specifically on that point, but it does at least give us the opportunity of saying not only is that an issue and a concern for the future but it is an issue that we should take seriously and we should discuss seriously and we should address seriously so that these particular problems, especially as it deals with State issues and State rights, will not be put in jeopardy with the future.

□ 1200

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, although I disagree with much of what the WTO does, I do not think it is in the best interest of our Nation to withdraw from that organization at this time. Doing so would give the United States little bargaining power as we work to promote a global economy that is both free and fair. Withdrawal would put in jeopardy negotiations that are necessary to meet that goal.

However, my support for the long-term goal of more equitable international trade does not translate into blanket support, but it is difficult to ignore the fact that the U.S. is increasingly the target of WTO action. We are sued more than any other country, and our laws seem to be condemned by the WTO every month. We have been the defendant in 19 of the last 36 cases decided by the appellate body. These negative decisions have threatened American products and American businesses with sanctions. For example, in recent years the WTO has disapproved everything from our tax policies and trade laws to our sovereign right to regulate activity such as Internet gambling and set tariffs against unfair pricing by foreign countries.

It is becoming all too clear that these decisions are not the result of any shortcomings by this country or any true violation of international rules; rather, one must wonder if we are facing a forum that sees our country's prosperity and economic success as an opportunity to further bolster their own industries and markets. It seems as though nations are using the WTO to gain through litigation that they could not secure through negotiation.

But to help our economy, we cannot turn toward a simplistic, bellicose jingoism approach that blames the WTO and seeks protectionism as the answer to all. What we need to do on our own is to pass our energy policy that is otherwise costing us millions of jobs and to pass our own health care reforms to cut costs and not cut care.

Free trade is in everyone's best interest, and the WTO negotiations are vital to securing new markets for American products and creating new jobs for

American workers. The negotiations must ultimately bring us to a system that is fair for all member countries while respecting the fundamental rights of a nation to determine its own law.

This administration needs to pay very close attention to the issue as we cannot sit idly by while the world unfairly threatens U.S. laws and remedies designed to protect our Nation against unfair practices.

The WTO clearly is not operating always in the best interests of the United States of America. However, it is the forum that exists; and as such, we need to remain partners with those that are vigilant and vigorous defenders of both free and fair trade in that forum for the benefit of our Nation.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) who has been leading this Congress in opposition to the disastrous CAFTA agreement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the good work of my friend, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Committee on Appropriations passed an amendment to prevent the U.S. trade representative from using trade pacts as a tool to block prescription drug reimportation. The fact that appropriators in this body felt compelled to take this dramatic step points to a larger issue. Congress should not have to police the U.S. trade representative to make sure he or she is acting in the best interests of U.S. consumers. We should not have to instruct our trade representative to make sure that he is looking out for U.S. workers and U.S. manufacturers. We should not have to tell the trade representative to protect the environment and our food supply.

Congress should not have to scour every trade pact to make sure that some patent extension or importation barrier or other Big Government crutch designed specifically for the drug industry has not been inserted into the trade agreement by the U.S. trade representative or by the President or by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Congress should not have to take the U.S. trade representative to task for trying to reverse the world's progress against the global AIDS epidemic, progress partially financed with U.S. tax dollars. Congress should not have to fight the U.S. trade representative in order to ensure jobs for our Nation's workforce, affordable medicine for our Nation's consumers, and manufacturing capacity for our Nation's protection.

Who does the U.S. trade representative work for?

The USTR should be acting in the interest of all Americans. If the international drug industry benefits too, all the better. Instead, the multinational drug industry's interests trump those every day of everyday Americans. The tail is wagging the dog. In fact, our

trade representative's office includes a position, and I am not making this up, our trade representative's office includes a position called U.S. Trade Representative for Asia, Pacific and Pharmaceutical Policies. So we are bringing the drug industry into the USTR to make sure these trade agreements protect the drug industry, usually at the expense of American consumers who pay twice as much, three times as much, four times as much for prescription drugs, and even more seriously, frankly, who harm the world's poorest people.

In the CAFTA agreement, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) said earlier, in Africa, in Asia, the world's poorest people have to pay more for prescription drugs because the U.S. has, in our trade representative's office, a U.S. trade representative for Asia, Pacific and pharmaceutical policy. It begs the question, What are our trade agreements for?

Mr. Speaker, it is not like they are working. Look what has happened to our trade deficit in the last 12 years. I came to Congress in 1992. We had a trade deficit of \$38 billion. In 2004, 12 years later, our trade deficit was \$618 billion. From \$38 billion to \$618 billion, and my friends are arguing our trade policy is working?

Look at our stagnating wages, the fact that the top 10 percent of people in this society are doing very well. Their incomes are going up and up and up. The 90 percent of the rest of the country, their wages are stagnant and partly because of trade policies. Look at our crippling job loss in my State, and especially in manufacturing.

Not only has our trade deficit gone from \$38 billion to \$618 billion in only a dozen years, look at what has happened in manufacturing. The States in red have all lost 20 percent of their manufacturing in the last 5 years. My State of Ohio, 216; Pennsylvania, 200; Michigan, 210; Alabama and Mississippi combined, 130; Illinois, 225; Virginia, 80,000; New York, 220,000. Our trade policy, Mr. Speaker, simply is not working.

When Members think about this, maybe in fact some people would say our trade agreements are working. After all, these trade agreements do work for the pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in thoughtful support for H.J. Res. 27, and I say thoughtful because I believe we should take a good look at what we are doing and what has been proposed and try to figure out what is going to happen in the future, and what are the ideas that these decisions are based upon.

We are living in a time when a significant number of Americans are rushing forward to support any effort to transfer sovereignty from elected officials in the United States to unelected officials elsewhere at a global level who will exercise power and control,



mandate policies and shape our lives; yet they are not elected by the people of the United States of America, as if we should expect them in the WTO or even the United Nations to watch out for our interests.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job to watch out for the interests of the American people. We are elected to do so. Transferring our sovereignty and decision-making power to the WTO, to the United Nations, or any other international body is not in the long-term interests of our people.

The United States did this back in the 1950s or 1940s with the United Nations, and it too was a dream, a dream for a better world, a new order that would bring about prosperity and peace. What do we see now in the United Nations, corruption at the highest levels and arrogance. We see United Nations peacekeeping troops stand by as people are massacred. They themselves have participated in atrocities, and yet we see cover-up at the United Nations and corruption. Is that the type of people we want to give sovereignty to? No.

So why do we think the WTO is going to be any different? The WTO is made up of nondemocratic countries as well as democratic countries, just like the United Nations. We are not going to bring them up; they will bring us down if we give up our decision-making process to unelected bodies that have been set up.

They call it the new world order. The new world order, what is that going to bring the American people? A loss of sovereignty, a loss of our ability to control our own destinies. We will see the WTO manipulated by special interests in the same way we have seen other bodies manipulated by special interests, but the WTO will be made up of organizations that are comprised of governments that do not believe in democracy and honesty and free press and free speech and the standards we believe in.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years from now as the WTO evolves, and even today, we will find our huge international corporations and international corporations in general going to these bodies and manipulating them and bribing them. And why not accept the bribes? The people of Burma or China or these other countries who are not democratic, who are not honest, that is their way of life. So why are we transferring authority, putting our faith in an organization, even if today in the short run we can see some examples where it might be in our benefit? In the long run it is not to the benefit of the American people to give up this kind of decisionmaking.

If we want more trade in the world, we should establish bilateral trade agreements with other democratic countries. That way we can control the decision-making process. The major economic countries of the world will enter into those agreements.

I say we should have free trade between free people. We should not be es-

tablishing superpowerful, unelected bodies by the WTO to control our destiny in the United States and determine what economic policies we will have in the long run. These things make no sense to me, and it is a great threat looming over us. Whatever examples can be given today of some good things that are happening, just remember what will happen 10 years down the road once these panels and bodies have been corrupted by the vicious dictatorships that we have let into the WTO.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this resolution because it is a little too radical for where I am now, but I am tempted to vote for it because of the failure of our current policies and the blindness of those who defend them.

Those who defend our current policies acknowledge that free trade puts pressure on countries to race to the bottom on environmental and labor standards so they can be the low-cost, high-value producer. But the real disconnect is between the theory of free trade and on-the-ground business reality.

Those who defend the WTO live in a world of theory in which business and consumers will buy American goods if they are good values, subject only to the written transparent regulations and tariff laws of their country. This theory is true in the United States where our businesses and consumers are happy to buy. We have lowered our tariffs, we have lowered our regulations and barriers, and there has been an explosion of imports to the United States.

But the theory is false as to China and many other nations. In those countries, their written laws are almost irrelevant; and so we negotiate hard, we open our markets in return for a change of China's written laws, and then we are surprised when changing those laws does nothing to open their markets and the average person in China buys less than 3 cents, I believe it is, of goods and services from America every day.

Why is this? Because their businesses are told orally, do not buy from America unless you get a co-production agreement, do not buy from America unless you get a disclosure of our technology and our manufacturing techniques. So when an airline in the United States goes to decide which airplane to buy, it does so on economic factors. When China buys, they demand that more and more production be shifted to China. No wonder we have this huge trade deficit and the dollar is certainly in peril.

□ 1215

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains for either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from

Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has 15 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has 7 minutes remaining.

The Chair will recognize the closing speeches in the reverse order of the openings: the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has the right to close.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I once again rise to urge my colleagues to reject this resolution. It is important that we work within a rules-based trading system in order to expand opportunities. Only by working within a rules-based trading system can we raise the international bar on labor standards, on environmental standards. If we were to pull out of the WTO, we would have no opportunity to raise at all the labor standards in other countries or the environmental standards. We need to be within a rules-based trading system to reduce barriers.

The U.S. market is the most open market. We want our trading partners to open up their markets. Staying within the WTO offers us that opportunity. We need effective enforcement of our agreements. We need to work within the WTO in order to accomplish those objectives. And, Mr. Speaker, here is an area where we must exercise more of our responsibility by changing laws and strengthening laws so that we can enforce the obligations that we have negotiated within the WTO. I will be introducing legislation to do that, and I urge my colleagues to work with me so that we can enforce the agreements that we have reached with other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution. Let us work together to open up markets.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

To begin with, at a time when there is so much animosity and partisanship in this body, I am very pleased that what we have brought forth together is a true bipartisan effort.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENBRENNER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for cosponsoring this amendment and, as I think most people know, that covers a very, very broad spectrum of political thought.

Mr. Speaker, some have argued against this resolution by saying it

would be a disaster if it were passed, that we would be withdrawing from the international economy, but the reality is that what we are trying to do here is not to withdraw from international trade. Trade is a good thing. What we are saying is let us send a message to the President of the United States to wake up and to fully recognize that our current trade policies are an unmitigated failure and that we have got to renegotiate them. We cannot continue on the policy of the race to the bottom. That has got to change.

Some of my friends say what we are talking about is international rules, and of course we are talking about international rules. The problem is that the rules within this WTO are rigged against the middle class of America. If the United States Congress said, wait a second, we are going to pass a law because we think it is unfair that slave labor in China is producing a product that is exported to the United States, or that child labor around the world is competing against American workers, we will be ruled incorrect by the WTO. A complaint will be waged against us saying, gee, why are you protesting slave labor or child labor? You are violating international free trade.

Another issue that has not been touched on today, a moral issue, which is very important, when I was mayor of the City of Burlington in the 1980s, we passed, as did cities throughout the country, as did the United States Congress, legislation which said to the apartheid regime which had then imprisoned Nelson Mandela, we are going to impose trade restrictions against an apartheid regime. Mr. Speaker, if that occurred today, if the City of Burlington, Vermont, the State of Vermont, the United States Congress, said we want to bring down economically some type of fascistic government running the country, that country would go to the WTO and the WTO would say, gee, you are in violation of free trade agreements. It does not matter the morality of the issue. The only thing that matters is unfettered free trade.

Mr. Speaker, what my friends on the other side of this debate have really failed to discuss is the impact of the unfettered trade policies that we have been developing over the last 30 years. You have not heard them say really one word about that. Yes, they have talked about economic growth that is taking place in America, but they forgot to tell you who was benefiting from that economic growth. They have forgotten to tell you that for the average American worker his or her wages have gone down significantly in the last 30 years.

Yes, the wealthiest people in this country are making out like bandits. Yes, there has been a doubling in the gap between the rich and the poor. That is true. Yes, CEOs of large corporations make 400 times what their workers make. Is that the free trade agreement that we are fighting for?

The reality is, and they know it, Republicans know it, Democrats, conservatives, progressives, when going back to their district. In my State in the last couple of months, I had to talk to workers whose jobs are gone because those companies could not compete against imports coming in from China where workers are paid 30 cents an hour.

I would yield a moment to my friends on the other side if they want to tell the American people that they think it is fair that our working people should have to compete against desperate people working for pennies an hour who go to jail when they stand up for their rights. I would yield to the gentleman from Florida, the gentleman from Maryland, or anyone else who wants to tell me now that that is fair. I do not hear anybody saying that it is fair.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that is unfair. I agree with my colleague completely. The question is, why are we not negotiating with our trading partners to do something about that?

Mr. SANDERS. Taking back my time, and I thank the gentleman. He says that it is unfair. But we have had this trade agreement, we have been in the WTO for 10 years. We have had a Democratic President. We have had a Republican President. If it is unfair, why is the President of the United States not going to the WTO tomorrow? Why did Bill Clinton not go? I do not want to be partisan here. Why did neither of them go? And they are not going to go.

The issue here is that these trade agreements have been forced on Congress, not forced, Congress willfully did it, because of the power of big money. It is no secret. Some of us who were here for NAFTA, some of us here for the China agreement, we know the millions and millions of dollars in campaign contributions and huge lobbying effort on the part of the large corporations. Because the truth of the matter is that while unfettered free trade is a disaster for the middle class and working families of this country, it really does benefit the heads of large corporations. They are, in fact, doing very well.

We see General Electric, General Motors moving to China. That is not a good thing for Americans.

Let me conclude simply by saying, Mr. Speaker, let us send the President of the United States a message. Let us say that our current trade policies are failing. Let us stand up for working families around the country. Let us pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is quite a bit of ground that we have covered here this morning. One is

that somehow CAFTA has been brought into this debate by a couple of speakers.

I would like to submit for printing in the RECORD a letter dated June 8, 2005, which was just yesterday, from former President Jimmy Carter to Mr. BILL THOMAS, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in support of CAFTA.

In this letter, he says, If the United States Congress were to turn its back on CAFTA, it would undercut these fragile democracies, compel them to retreat to protectionism, and make it harder for them to cooperate with the United States.

This is the type of bipartisan cooperation that we are about here today. It is important, I think, to realize that this resolution came before the Ways and Means Committee because we were required to take it up if it were to be filed under the law originally bringing us into the World Trade Organization. On both sides of the aisle, I believe I am correct on this, that the decision by the Ways and Means Committee to report this out unfavorably to the House, which we had to do procedurally, but to report it out unfavorably, I think, was unanimous on both sides of the aisle.

There is criticism as to what is happening, and some people would like to change some of the things within the framework of the World Trade Organization, but the Ways and Means Committee, I think, was very, very responsible.

Now the question of jobs and the economy has been raised, and China has been brought into this debate. China has got some problems with their currency and some things we need to do and their enforcement of their own laws. I will yield that ground to those that bring that criticism to us. But I think it is important to realize where those jobs are coming from or where those exports, who are the winners and losers with regard to the Chinese exports.

The Chinese exports are draining off the exports from Japan, Korea and other Pacific Asian countries. That is where those jobs are coming from. If you talk about and look at exactly the exports into the United States from that region of the world, you will see that it is fairly flat, not for China, but China is increasing its exports at the expense of these other countries.

The question has been brought into this debate as to the sovereignty of the United States. It is very clear to anyone, any of the lawmakers in this Congress, that Congress and the President make United States laws. The World Trade Organization cannot change laws either today or in the future. The World Trade Organization has no enforcement authority. It cannot impose fines, levies, sanctions, modify tariff rates or change the laws of any country. The only sanction for a violation of the World Trade Organization is that affected World Trade Organization

member, and that member country may in some cases impose retaliatory measures on trade of the country that violates the rules. But that is not enforcement by the World Trade Organization. The World Trade Organization agreement permits the United States to regulate and even stop trade to protect United States national security, public health and safety, natural resources and human rights. So we are not giving up any of our sovereignty by remaining in the World Trade Organization.

On the question of jobs and the exporting of American jobs, exports account for about 25 percent of the United States economic growth over the course of the past decade. Exports support an estimated 12 million jobs, and those workers' wages are estimated to pay 13 to 18 percent more on the average than nonexport jobs. United States exports directly support one in every five manufacturing jobs. Workers in most trade-engaged industries where combined exports and imports amount to at least 40 percent of their domestic industrial output earn an annual compensation package that is one-third more than the average compensation in the least trade-engaged sectors. A recent University of Michigan study shows that lowering remaining global trade barriers by just one-third would boost annual average family income by an additional \$2,500.

So if you are interested in jobs, vote against this resolution. If you are interested in the economy and the growth of our economy of this United States, vote against this resolution. If you want chaos in world trade, vote for it, because that would exactly be what we would have. We would have total chaos. It would be the wild, wild west. I think that the only responsible vote here today for the American worker and the American economy is to vote no on this resolution.

JUNE 8, 2005.

Hon. BILL THOMAS,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

TO REPRESENTATIVE BILL THOMAS: as you prepare for your initial consideration of the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) with the nations of Central America and the Dominican Republic, I want to express my strong support for this progressive move. From a trade perspective, this will help both the United States and Central America.

Some 80 percent of Central America's exports to the U.S. are already duty free, so they will be opening their markets to U.S. exports more than we will for their remaining products. Independent studies indicate that U.S. incomes will rise by over \$15 billion and those in Central America by some \$5 billion. New jobs will be created in Central America, and labor standards are likely to improve as a result of CAFTA.

Some improvements could be made in the trade bill, particularly on the labor protection side, but, more importantly our own national security and hemispheric influence will be enhanced with improved stability, democracy, and development in our poor, fragile neighbors in Central America and the Caribbean. During my presidency and now at

The Carter Center, I have been dedicated to the promotion of democracy and stability in the region. From the negotiation of the Panama Canal Treaties and the championing of human rights at the time when the region suffered under military dictatorships to the monitoring of a number of free elections in the region, Central America has been a major focus of my attention.

There now are democratically elected governments in each of the countries covered by CAFTA. In negotiating this agreement, the president of each of the six nations had to content with their own companies that fear competition with U.S. firms. They have put their credibility on the line, not only with this trade agreement but more broadly by promoting market reforms that have been urged for decades by U.S. presidents of both parties. If the U.S. Congress were to turn its back on CAFTA, it would undercut these fragile democracies, compel them to retreat to protectionism, and make it harder for them to cooperate with the U.S.

For the first time ever, we have a chance to reinforce democracies in the region. This is the moment to move forward and to help those leaders that want to modernize and humanize their countries. Moreover, strong economies in the region are the best antidote to illegal immigration from the region.

In appreciate your consideration of my views and hope they will be helpful in your important deliberations.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about H. Res. 27. H. Res. 27 would withdraw the United States from participation in the World Trade Organization. I did not support a similar resolution five years ago, and I do not support this resolution today.

International trade is not just inevitable, it is a good thing. We live in a world today where more people can afford ever cheaper goods. But lowering the cost of goods and increasing their availability is not the single goal of trade. Trade done right helps lift the global standard of living and works to protect the irreplaceable environment we inherited. Trade is about values. I want to make sure the United States not only exports our-world class agriculture, but also our respect for the natural environment and enforceable labor laws. We should make sure we export the goods we produce and not the workers who produce them.

That is why we must use the WTO to address these labor and environmental concerns. But if we walk away from the WTO, we won't be able to address any of these issues. Where else can we give voice to issues of child labor or environmentally destructive practices of some industries? The WTO—imperfect as it may be—is the forum that we, along with the other members of the international community, established to enforce trade rules and more importantly allow for an open dialogue on the trade issues that concern us.

We need to realize that even if there are legitimate problems with the WTO, and I agree that some exist, the solution is not to unilaterally withdraw from the WTO. Withdrawing from the WTO would not help to solve any of these problems. Not one. We cannot stop trade, and we cannot end the global economy. What we can do is work within the World Trade Organization to address these concerns. We should not allow any others to dictate to us about what is in our national interest, but we must recognize that we cannot accomplish our national goals in isolation from the rest of the world. We can only work to protect American

workers from anticompetitive practices of foreign countries from within the WTO, not by sitting on the sidelines. We should be working with our trade partners and with the WTO to enforce our existing trade rules. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 27, which withdraws approval of the United States from the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization.

The WTO was created to oversee and regulate international commerce through the establishment of universal trade agreements. The institution of these agreements would provide assurance and accountability between member nations, with the prospect of future economic prosperity. The goal of these trade practices is to ease facilitation of global business for producers, exporters, and importers.

My opposition to this resolution and consequent support of the WTO is not without qualification.

While there is great value in continuing multilateral trade regulations and maintaining the general integrity of the WTO, this organization has consistently foundered in its role of impartial adjudicator and continues to undermine the domestic trade sovereignty of our Nation.

Over the past decade, we have witnessed a massive increase in the U.S. trade deficit, an alarming number of dislocated American workers, and consistent threats to the autonomy of U.S. domestic trade policy.

The international community has seen the numerous shortcomings of the WTO system, including poorly enforced labor laws that afford many countries an unfortunate competitive advantage in the global marketplace. The premise of independent unionization and equitable development has not been realized in the past 10 years under the WTO and continues to underscore the need for a reevaluation and modification of the institution.

Though the World Trade Organization has failed to deliver on the promises of economic gains to developing countries and general worldwide trade policy, the solution is not to withdraw U.S. support or approval. We must continue to work inside the infrastructure of the WTO and towards progressive policies. As a principal partner in the WTO, we must not disassociate ourselves from the organization or we will realize the regression of our global economy. Our obligations to the American worker necessitate a competent and responsible trade policy that can only be achieved through the refinement of the current system.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution but reserve judgment over the current policies and procedures of the World Trade Organization. It is in the best interests of our nation to continue our active involvement in the WTO, while reconsidering and reworking current international trade policies.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 27, which would withdraw the United States from further participation in the World Trade Organization (WTO). I do so not because I am against international institutions, or even the stated purpose of the WTO. I am voting yes today to voice my opposition to U.S. trade policies that continue to augment the "race to the bottom" international trade culture that has sent good-paying American jobs overseas in pursuit of ever-lower wages and lax labor and environmental standards. Instead of pursuing policies that lift up and improve the lives of workers in this country and

around the world, we have crippled U.S. communities while enabling the exploitation of foreign workforces.

I believe Congress must send a strong signal to the current administration that the past ten years have demonstrated the serious failures of U.S. trade policy. In light of our massive trade deficit, loss of manufacturing jobs and the ongoing currency manipulation by foreign countries, my vote today supports the hard working families in America. To have fair, sustainable, and balanced international trade, we need a fundamental review of U.S. international trade policies, and Congress and the Bush administration should take this opportunity to lead this effort.

There are serious national security considerations inherent in our trade policy, and I believe we ignore these ramifications at our own risk. Our social fabric is also endangered—as jobs leave the country, as people that have worked hard their entire lives lose their pensions and healthcare, what are these families to do? What made the U.S. the greatest country in the world is the ability of high school educated Americans to make a good living in the manufacturing and industrial sectors. These jobs increasingly have moved overseas, and it is hard to support a family on service sector wages. Meanwhile, I have tried twice in the last year to pass an amendment to simply study the issue of the outsourcing of American jobs, and have twice been defeated on close votes.

Mr. Speaker, voting yes today will not solve these problems, but it will signal that we will reevaluate the trade policy of this nation. I urge my colleagues to undertake this work and vote yes on H.J. Res. 27.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 27, a resolution withdrawing the U.S. approval of the WTO.

While there are legitimate disagreements about how world trade is organized, and how trade agreements are negotiated, I think that it is important to have a forum and structure for international trade. And that's the World Trade Organization.

Let's not overlook the fact that in the 10 years since the WTO's inception, we've seen global tariff rates fall and U.S. exports rise.

Moreover, ninety-seven percent of our international trade is with other WTO nations. Withdrawing from the WTO would upset relations with these important partners and markets.

That being said, the WTO is by no means a perfect institution. It is important that we are having this debate today.

In the ongoing Doha round of trade negotiations, the U.S. and our global partners have the opportunity to substantially improve the WTO by reaching agreements on service negotiations, the reduction of tariffs and non-tariff barriers, and the authority of the WTO dispute resolution system. We need to see these negotiations through to a satisfactory end.

Nevertheless, despite its imperfections, the WTO provides a stable and predictable global trading system that benefits the U.S. both economically and strategically.

And although I will be watching the Doha Round with keen interest, I support U.S. participation in the WTO and therefore oppose this resolution.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to question whether

or not the United States should remain in the WTO. Among them: the current trade deficit of \$618 billion; the disappointing enforcement efforts of the Administration on past trade agreements; and the lack of consensus in the WTO on how to move forward with the Doha Round. But at this point, it is too early to give up hope. The WTO is essentially our only chance to address the major distortions in world agricultural markets.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development is a group of 30 countries including the United States, most European countries, Japan, Mexico, Australia, and New Zealand. It is widely regarded as the most reliable source of objective information comparing subsidy levels of various developed countries.

Perhaps the most useful number the OECD calculates is one that compares the amount of each dollar that a farmer receives due to government policies, such as tariffs or farm support programs, versus the amount the farmer receives from the marketplace. They call this number the Producer Support Estimate.

In its 2004 report on Agriculture, the OECD notes that the Producer Support Estimate for the United States decreased in recent years, and that this is a part of a long term trend in U.S. agricultural policy. As the OECD points out, support in the U.S. to producers decreased from 25% in 1986–88 to 18% in 2003, and has remained below the OECD average. Europe has increased support to 37% in 2003.

What this means is that European farmers rely on the government for twice as much of their income as do U.S. farmers—or 37 cents from each dollar versus 18 cents for U.S. farmers.

What relevance do all these statistics have to the current WTO negotiations on agriculture? The framework agreement provides for harmonization in all three major areas of negotiation. On domestic subsidies, the framework states: "Specifically, higher levels of permitted trade-distorting domestic support will be subject to deeper cuts."

In the section of the WTO framework agreement on export competition, it is agreed that export subsidies will be eliminated. The EU remains the largest user of export subsidies in the world, and the elimination of export subsidies will eventually apply additional pressure to its domestic subsidy programs.

In the section of the WTO framework agreement dealing with market access, there is language calling for a tiered formula with "deeper cuts in higher tariffs". Average U.S. tariffs on agricultural products is 12% versus 30% in Europe and 50% in Japan. The world average tariff on agricultural products is 62%. This means that the U.S. tariffs on agricultural imports should be cut less than European, Japanese, or other countries tariffs on our exports to them.

As with all negotiations, the framework agreement reached last July on agriculture allows for a best-case and worst-case scenario to exist, which future negotiations will determine. In these negotiations, we will depend on our U.S. Trade Representative to achieve a result that upholds the principle of harmonization that was set out in the original U.S. negotiating position in June of 2000. If that principle is upheld in the final agreement, we will be glad we rejected this resolution today. If not, it will be time to give serious consideration to leaving the WTO.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on H.J. Res. 27, which seeks to

withdraw the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization.

During my first term in Congress, I witnessed firsthand the breakdown in affairs at the World Trade Organization's trade negotiations in Mexico. Negotiations collapsed as delegates from many underdeveloped countries celebrated their perceived success as an increasingly powerful band of poor farming countries, known as G–21, held strong to prevent talks from proceeding.

It is important that each participating country have a voice in negotiations, but by banding together to divert trade talks, underdeveloped countries ultimately hurt themselves. No one in Europe or the United States will starve to death because of their efforts, but the citizens in their own countries will be put at risk.

What occurred puts the viability of the WTO in question, but it also allows the U.S. to go forth with trade promotion authorization on its own. While I believe the WTO needs reform, I do not want us to abandon our place at the table. If America were to pull out of the WTO, we would lose the ability to influence the organization and its negotiations internally.

Our farmers and producers in Iowa and across the country are some of the most efficient in the world and are capable of competing and winning in world markets, so long as they do not face unfair foreign government policies. The enforcement of a rules-based trading system through the World Trade Organization is our best opportunity to gain access to these markets for our Nation's farmers and rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against H.J. Res. 27 because it is clear that our economic interests continue to benefit from engagement with trading partners.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, today the House will undoubtedly vote down this resolution and signal strong support for remaining in the World Trade Organization. This is the right decision to make.

It is the right decision to make because the WTO, and its predecessor, the GATT, have served as a catalyst to reduce both tariff and non-tariff barriers for U.S. exports. Since the formation of the GATT, average tariffs in industrialized countries have gone down from 40 to less than 4 percent; since the creation of the WTO in 1994, U.S. exports have increased by \$300 billion. Of course, the WTO has also served as a useful forum to break-down barriers to U.S. agricultural exports where bilateral negotiations could not.

While I will vote against this resolution today, it is not without any reservation. Mr. Speaker, I believe the resolution on the floor today provides the ideal time to pause and reflect on the shortcomings of the current WTO system and on ways both the Congress and the Administration can make changes to the WTO structure so that it works better and rebuilds confidence in the system among our constituencies.

I find the lack of any serious effort to reform the current WTO culture and structure to fix the flaws with the unsatisfactory. There are a host of problems with the WTO, and the number of problems is only growing.

The WTO completely lacks any degree of transparency; hearings are closed to the public and public transcripts are not released. Where, in a very limited manner, WTO rules permit limited transparency by allowing the assistance and resources of private parties who

are supportive of the U.S. government position, the Administration has chosen not to utilize this allowance.

Transparency is not the only problem contributing to the WTO's failure to move rules-based trade forward globally, but it is the central factor allowing the WTO and its bureaucrats to escape the scrutiny which would quickly eradicate other abuses in Geneva. Through the lack of transparency, the WTO dispute settlement and Appellate bodies are emboldened to disregard the proper standard of review in disputes involving trade laws, for example. In this way, past WTO panels have issued rogue decisions against the U.S. with no basis or standing in the context of previously negotiated Agreements. This rampant judicial activism is rapidly undermining the support for the WTO.

As the WTO is particularly prone to Yankee-bashing, support for the current, broken system is perhaps fading fastest here at home. A slew of activist decisions against the U.S., attacking our trade remedy laws and another decision amounting to micromanagement of U.S. tax policy have come at a steady pace.

These decisions have been particularly frustrating to many Members of Congress because of limited opportunity for oversight by Congress of the WTO or its decisions which affect our domestic laws and domestic employers. I, along with several of my Ways and Means colleagues, last Congress introduced the Trade Law Reform Act. This legislation included a provision to establish a WTO Dispute Settlement Review Commission. This Commission, composed of retired federal judges, would report to Congress after reviewing WTO decisions adverse to the U.S. in order to determine whether the relevant decision makers failed to follow the applicable standard of review or otherwise abused their mandate.

Today, we have spent two hours debating whether Congress should withdraw from the WTO. Yet, absent a new entity to administer and advance rules-based trade, there is no question that we must remain committed to, and engaged in, the WTO. I would submit that instead of debating whether to withdraw from the WTO, Congress should have an active debate on ways we can make the current system work properly, as it was designed to do, and ways to make it better.

The U.S. must move swiftly to put an end to judicial activism in the WTO and reorganize the structure and culture of both the Appellate Body and the dispute settlement body. Additionally, the USTR should deputize private parties with a direct and substantial interest in a case to appear and participate in WTO proceedings and devote greater resources to litigation in WTO disputes. Mr. Speaker, Congress must also establish new mechanisms to increase oversight of the WTO.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my Ways and Means Democratic colleagues regarding the United States continued participation in the World Trade Organization (WTO). I do not agree with House Joint Resolution 27 and withdrawing Congressional approval of the WTO agreement.

Our society is becoming global. There is growing interdependence of countries, resulting from the increasing integration of trade, finance, people, and ideas in one global marketplace. So, as international trade expands due to globalization, we need a set of trade rules and an international body to enforce those rules—the WTO.

The WTO, and its predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, have opened foreign markets around the world for U.S. goods and services. This has created new opportunities for U.S. businesses, farmers, manufacturers, and workers. The U.S. economy is stronger because of the WTO.

There are improvements, however, that can be made. There has to be better collaboration in understanding the relationship between trade and labor issues. We must ensure that core labor standards are enforced, particularly in developing economies. We must have more meaningful dialogue about environmental issues in trade discussions. We can accomplish this by fully integrating the work of the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment into the work of WTO negotiating groups.

Furthermore, the WTO needs to be fully aware of the vulnerability of our domestic steel industry. Ohio is the nation's leading producer of steel. China's strategy of undervaluing their currency, the yuan, and dumping steel into our domestic market puts Ohioans in danger of losing their jobs. Ohio manufacturers produced \$4.59 billion in value-added steel production and processing last year. The steel industry generates over 110,000 jobs in the State of Ohio. We cannot compromise the strength of our domestic steel industry. The WTO must be cognizant of the trade challenges faced by U.S. steel manufacturers.

I believe that the United States should continue to be a member of the WTO and remain committed to free trade. However, we must ensure that our domestic concerns are properly addressed within the WTO.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 27. Withdrawing from the World Trade Organization (WTO) would be an abandonment of America's leadership in trade and an economic disaster for our nation.

For decades, the United States has been the leading voice in the world for the free market system and economic cooperation among nations because capitalism works for America. We were one of the founders of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade as well as its successor, the WTO. America has consistently pushed for a rational, rules-based approach in dealing with international trade because we know our unique, competitive, vibrant, and innovative economy will allow most U.S. economic sectors to compete successfully against any nation provided we have a fair playing field and open access to foreign markets.

If we abandon the WTO, we abandon those years of leadership in trade. Do we want the Europeans or the Japanese to be the economic model other nations look to emulate? Do we really want them to decide the rules by which the rest of the world economy will run? If we shut ourselves out of the process, we put our farmers, manufacturers, businesses, and workers at a strategic disadvantage compared to others in the world.

North Carolina's economy depends on exports, and we need to break down barriers to overseas markets so that our technology, agriculture, manufacturing and other sectors can expand on our progress in international competition. Studies show that one in five manufacturing jobs in North Carolina depend on exports. These jobs on average pay 13–18 percent more than the U.S. average. Every \$1 billion in exports creates 20,000 jobs in the United States.

The United States represents only 4.7 percent of the world population. If we want our economy to continue to grow, we need to be able to sell to the other 95.3 percent of the world. The WTO, for all its flaws and faults, remains the best venue for leveling the playing field and gaining access to new markets. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote down this resolution.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify my opposition to H.J. Res. 27, a resolution to withdraw U.S. approval of the Uruguay Round Agreement Act establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Although I oppose the resolution, I am glad we are having this debate today. The 1994 law that helped create the WTO included an important provision that allows Congress to reassess U.S. participation in the organization every five years. The constantly shifting global trade landscape makes regular Congressional review of U.S. participation in the WTO especially critical.

Like many of my constituents, I am concerned about investment and jobs moving to other countries that have weaker labor and environmental standards. I am also concerned about the growing U.S. trade deficit, WTO pressure to downgrade our consumer protections, and challenges to our federal laws posed by the WTO's closed dispute resolution tribunals.

But retaining U.S. participation in the WTO doesn't mean we can't or shouldn't work to improve global trading system. The objective should be to mend it, not end it. The WTO is the only international organization dealing with the global rules of trade between nations. Over 90 percent of all world trade is conducted within the WTO.

Withdrawal from the WTO would isolate the U.S. from the international economy. It would also eliminate the best recourse American businesses and workers have when faced with unfair trade barriers: dispute resolution. If we were to withdraw from the WTO, other countries could impose unfair tariffs or other barriers to American goods, or "dump" goods, and we could only retaliate in return and risk getting into a potentially dangerous trade war.

If we want to grow and expand our economic opportunities, we must engage with the rest of the world. I believe that abandoning a rules-based trade system would be detrimental to American families, workers, business, and national security. We need to do all we can to ensure Americans benefit from the global economy. But shutting our doors on the WTO isn't the answer.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 304, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 86, nays 338, answered “present” 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

YEAS—86

Abercrombie	Goode	Owens
Aderholt	Green, Gene	Pallone
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pascarell
Barrett (SC)	Hinchey	Pastor
Barrow	Hostettler	Paul
Bartlett (MD)	Hunter	Payne
Bilirakis	Istook	Pombo
Bishop (UT)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Brown (OH)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Cardoza	Jones (NC)	Ryan (OH)
Coble	Jones (OH)	Sabo
Costa	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Costello	Kennedy (RI)	T.
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Sanders
Davis (TN)	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
DeFazio	Lee	Strickland
Doyle	Lynch	Stupak
Duncan	Marshall	Sullivan
Evans	McCotter	Tancredo
Everett	McIntyre	Taylor (MS)
Feeney	McKinney	Taylor (NC)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Tierney
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Visclosky
Franks (AZ)	Ney	Wamp
Garrett (NJ)	Norwood	Waters
Gibbons	Oberstar	Weldon (FL)
Gingrey	Obey	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Otter	Whitfield

NAYS—338

Ackerman	Case	Fossella
Akin	Castle	Frelinghuysen
Alexander	Chabot	Gallegly
Allen	Chandler	Gerlach
Andrews	Chocola	Gilchrest
Baca	Clay	Gillmor
Bachus	Cleaver	Gonzalez
Baird	Clyburn	Goodlatte
Baker	Cole (OK)	Gordon
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Granger
Bass	Conyers	Graves
Bean	Cooper	Green (WI)
Beauprez	Cramer	Green, Al
Becerra	Crenshaw	Gutierrez
Berkley	Crowley	Gutknecht
Berman	Cubin	Hall
Berry	Cuellar	Harman
Biggert	Culberson	Harris
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hart
Bishop (NY)	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Blackburn	Davis (AL)	Hayes
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Hayworth
Blunt	Davis (FL)	Hefley
Boehlert	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Boehner	Davis, Tom	Herger
Bonilla	DeGette	Herseth
Bonner	Delahunt	Higgins
Bono	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Boozman	DeLay	Hoekstra
Boren	Dent	Holden
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holt
Boucher	Diaz-Balart, M.	Honda
Boustany	Dicks	Hooley
Boyd	Dingell	Hoyer
Bradley (NH)	Doggett	Hyde
Brady (PA)	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Brady (TX)	Drake	Inslee
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Israel
Brown, Corrine	Edwards	Issa
Brown-Waite,	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Ginny	Emanuel	(TX)
Burgess	Emerson	Jefferson
Burton (IN)	Engel	Jindal
Butterfield	English (PA)	Johnson (CT)
Buyer	Eshoo	Johnson (IL)
Calvert	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Camp	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Fattah	Kanjorski
Cantor	Ferguson	Keller
Capito	Filner	Kelly
Capps	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kennedy (MN)
Capuano	Flake	Kilpatrick (MI)
Cardin	Foley	Kind
Carnahan	Forbes	King (IA)
Carson	Ford	King (NY)
Carter	Fortenberry	Kingston

Kirk	Myrick	Shadegg
Kline	Nadler	Shaw
Knollenberg	Napolitano	Shays
Kolbe	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Kuhl (NY)	Neugebauer	Sherwood
Langevin	Northup	Shimkus
Lantos	Nunes	Shuster
Larsen (WA)	Nussle	Simmons
Larson (CT)	Olver	Simpson
Latham	Ortiz	Skelton
Leach	Osborne	Slaughter
Levin	Oxley	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (CA)	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Lewis (KY)	Pence	Snyder
Linder	Peterson (MN)	Sodrel
LoBiondo	Peterson (PA)	Solis
Lofgren, Zoe	Petri	Souder
Lowe	Pickering	Spratt
Lucas	Pitts	Stark
Lungren, Daniel	Platts	Stearns
E.	Poe	Sweeney
Mack	Pomeroy	Tanner
Maloney	Porter	Tauscher
Manzullo	Price (GA)	Terry
Marchant	Price (NC)	Thomas
Markey	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Matheson	Putnam	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Radanovich	Thornberry
McCarthy	Ramstad	Tiahrt
McCaul (TX)	Rangel	Towns
McCollum (MN)	Regula	Turner
McCrery	Rehberg	Udall (CO)
McDermott	Reichert	Udall (NM)
McGovern	Renzi	Upton
McHenry	Reyes	Van Hollen
McHugh	Reynolds	Velázquez
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Walden (OR)
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Walsh
McNulty	Rogers (MI)	Wasserman
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Meek (FL)	Ross	Watson
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Watt
Melancon	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Mica	Royce	Weiner
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Weldon (PA)
Millender	Rush	Weller
McDonald	Ryan (WI)	Wexler
Miller (MI)	Ryun (KS)	Wicker
Miller (NC)	Salazar	Wilson (NM)
Miller, Gary	Sánchez, Loretta	Wilson (SC)
Miller, George	Saxton	Wolf
Moore (KS)	Schiff	Woolsey
Moore (WI)	Schwartz (PA)	Wu
Moran (KS)	Schwartz (MI)	Wynn
Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	Young (AK)
Murphy	Scott (VA)	Young (FL)
Murtha	Serrano	
Musgrave	Sessions	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—8

Cox	Hobson	Menendez
Davis, Jo Ann	Hulshof	Tiberi
Hastings (FL)	LaHood	

□ 1257

Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, BACHUS, BRADY of Texas, KINGSTON and SHADEGG changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GARRETT of New Jersey, SULLIVAN, FRANKS of Arizona, GINGREY, BARRETT of South Carolina and MOLLOHAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, in rollcall vote 239 held today on H.J. Res. 27 I was recorded as “yea.” This incorrectly represents my view on this resolution. I intended for my

vote to be recorded as “no.” I have long been a supporter of free trade, and though I believe the WTO may have some faults, I support the United States membership in the organization.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—RESTORING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN ETHICS PROCESS

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, we are halfway through the first session of the 109th Congress and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has yet to begin its important work; and because the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct refuses to obey the rules of the House and provide for a nonpartisan staff; therefore, pursuant to rule IX, I rise in regard to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas, in 1968, in furtherance of its constitutional authority and to promote the highest ethical standards for Members of Congress, the House of Representatives established the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

Whereas, the ethics procedures in effect during the 108th Congress, and in the three preceding Congresses, were enacted in 1997 in a bipartisan manner by an overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives upon the bipartisan recommendation of the ten member Ethics Reform Task Force which conducted a thorough and lengthy review of the entire ethics process;

Whereas, Rule XI, clause 3(g) of the Rules of the House, first adopted in 1997 upon the recommendation of the task force, provides that the Committee “staff be assembled and retained as a professional non-partisan staff” and “[a]ll staff member shall be appointed by an affirmative vote of the majority of the Members of the Committee;”

Whereas, Rule XI states that each such staff person “shall be professional and demonstrably qualified for the position which he is hired” and is prohibited from engaging in “any partisan political activity directly affecting any congressional or presidential election;”

Whereas, Rule XI also provides that, “in addition to any other staff provided by law, rule or other authority,” the Chair and Ranking Minority Member may each appoint, without a vote of the Committee, one person as a shared staff member from his or her personal staff to perform service for the Committee; and further provides such shared staff persons are exempt from the provision requiring that “the staff be assembled and retained as a professional, nonpartisan staff” and the provision stating that “no member of the staff shall engage in any partisan political activity directly affecting any congressional or presidential election;”

Whereas, from 1997 through 2004, the Staff Director/Chief Counsel and other professional staff were appointed by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, and the shared staff members exercised no supervisory or other authority over the professional staff;

Whereas, in January of 2005, the Chairman of the Committee improperly and unilaterally fired nonpartisan Committee staff;

Whereas, the Chairman now proposed to designate his shared staff person as the Committee Staff Director, clothed with supervisory authority, without subjecting him to a vote of the Committee;



Whereas, because of the Chairman's proposal and with nearly half of the First Session of the 109th Congress having expired, the committee has been unable to carry out its charge, set out in Rule XI, to investigate allegations of misconduct by Members and staff;

Whereas, the Committee's resulting inability to carry out its duties has subjected the House to public ridicule and produced contempt for the ethics process, thus bringing discredit to the House; now be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is hereby directed to proceed in accord with clause 3(g) of rule XI, to appoint, upon an affirmative vote of the majority of the Members of the Committee, a non-partisan professional staff.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). In the opinion of the Chair, the resolution constitutes a question of privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that if the gentleman from Missouri's motion prevails, that we will be unable to discuss the substance of the motion made by the minority leader?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The adoption of the motion to table would dispose of the resolution.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 199, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

AYES—219

Aderholt	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.
Akin	Burton (IN)	Doolittle
Alexander	Buyer	Drake
Bachus	Calvert	Dreier
Baker	Camp	Duncan
Barrett (SC)	Cannon	Ehlers
Bartlett (MD)	Cantor	Emerson
Barton (TX)	Capito	English (PA)
Bass	Carter	Feeney
Beauprez	Castle	Ferguson
Biggart	Chabot	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Bilirakis	Chocola	Flake
Bishop (UT)	Coble	Foley
Blackburn	Cole (OK)	Forbes
Blunt	Conaway	Fortenberry
Boehlert	Crenshaw	Fossella
Boehner	Cubin	Fox
Bonilla	Culberson	Franks (AZ)
Bonner	Cunningham	Frelinghuysen
Boozman	Davis (KY)	Galleghy
Boustany	Davis, Jo Ann	Garrett (NJ)
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom	Gerlach
Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)	Gibbons
Brown (SC)	DeLay	Gilchrest
Brown-Waite,	Dent	Gillmor
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gingrey

Gohmert	Mack	Rogers (AL)	Peterson (MN)	Schiff	Tierney
Goode	Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	Pomeroy	Schwartz (PA)	Towns
Goodlatte	Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Price (NC)	Scott (GA)	Udall (CO)
Graves	McCaul (TX)	Rohrabacher	Rahall	Scott (VA)	Udall (NM)
Green (WI)	McCotter	Ros-Lehtinen	Rangel	Serrano	Van Hollen
Gutknecht	McCrery	Royce	Reyes	Sherman	Velázquez
Hall	McHenry	Ryan (WI)	Ross	Skelton	Visclosky
Harris	McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Rothman	Slaughter	Wasserman
Hart	McKeon	Saxton	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Schwarz (MI)	Ruppersberger	Snyder	Waters
Hayes	Mica	Sensenbrenner	Rush	Solis	Watson
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Sessions	Ryan (OH)	Spratt	Watt
Hefley	Miller (MI)	Shadegg	Sabo	Stark	Waxman
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shaw	Salazar	Stupak	Weiner
Herger	Moran (KS)	Shays	Sánchez, Linda	Tanner	Wexler
Hoekstra	Murphy	Sherwood	T.	Tauscher	Woolsey
Hostettler	Musgrave	Shimkus	Sanchez, Loretta	Taylor (MS)	Wu
Hunter	Myrick	Shuster	Sanders	Thompson (CA)	Wynn
Hyde	Neugebauer	Simmons	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	
Inglis (SC)	Ney	Simpson			
Issa	Northup	Smith (NJ)			
Istook	Norwood	Smith (TX)			
Jenkins	Nunes	Sodrel			
Jindal	Nussle	Souder			
Johnson (CT)	Osborne	Stearns			
Johnson (IL)	Otter	Sullivan			
Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Tancredo			
Jones (NC)	Paul	Taylor (NC)			
Keller	Pearce	Thomas			
Kelly	Pence	Thornberry			
Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt			
King (IA)	Petri	Turner			
Kingston	Pickering	Upton			
Kirk	Pitts	Walden (OR)			
Kline	Platts	Walsh			
Knollenberg	Poe	Wamp			
Kolbe	Pombo	Weldon (FL)			
Kuhl (NY)	Porter	Weldon (PA)			
Latham	Price (GA)	Weller			
LaTourette	Pryce (OH)	Westmoreland			
Leach	Putnam	Whitfield			
Lewis (CA)	Radanovich	Wicker			
Lewis (KY)	Ramstad	Wilson (NM)			
Linder	Regula	Wilson (SC)			
LoBiondo	Rehberg	Wolf			
Lucas	Reichert	Young (AK)			
Lungren, Daniel	Renzi	Young (FL)			
E.	Reynolds				

NOES—199

Abercrombie	DeGette	Langevin
Ackerman	Delahunt	Lantos
Allen	DeLauro	Larsen (WA)
Andrews	Dicks	Larson (CT)
Baca	Dingell	Lee
Baird	Doggett	Levin
Baldwin	Doyle	Lewis (GA)
Barrow	Edwards	Lipinski
Bean	Emanuel	Lofgren, Zoe
Becerra	Engel	Lowey
Berkley	Eshoo	Lynch
Berman	Etheridge	Maloney
Berry	Evans	Markey
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Marshall
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Matheson
Blumenauer	Filner	Matsui
Boren	Ford	McCarthy
Boswell	Frank (MA)	McCollum (MN)
Boucher	Gonzalez	McDermott
Boyd	Gordon	McGovern
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	McIntyre
Brown (OH)	Green, Gene	McKinney
Brown, Corrine	Grijalva	McNulty
Butterfield	Gutierrez	Meehan
Capps	Harman	Meek (FL)
Capuano	Herseth	Meeks (NY)
Cardin	Higgins	Melancon
Cardoza	Hinche	Michaud
Carnahan	Hinojosa	Millender-
Carson	Holden	McDonald
Case	Holt	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Honda	Miller, George
Clay	Hooley	Mollohan
Cleaver	Hoyer	Moore (KS)
Clyburn	Inslee	Moore (WI)
Conyers	Israel	Moran (VA)
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
Costa	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano
Costello	(TX)	Neal (MA)
Cramer	Jefferson	Oberstar
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Cuellar	Jones (OH)	Oliver
Cummings	Kanjorski	Ortiz
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Owens
Davis (CA)	Kennedy (RI)	Pallone
Davis (FL)	Kildee	Pascarell
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor
Davis (TN)	Kind	Payne
DeFazio	Kucinich	Pelosi

NOT VOTING—15

Bono	Hobson	Murtha
Cox	Hulshof	Strickland
Everett	King (NY)	Sweeney
Granger	LaHood	Terry
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Tiberi

□ 1323

Ms. DEGETTE changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. OXLEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT JUNE 10, 2005, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, June 10, 2005, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, points of order are reserved.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT JUNE 10, 2005, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON SCIENCE, THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, June 10, 2005, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, points of order are reserved.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority whip the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and also for the cooperation of those on the appropriations bills this week as we move to an early conclusion of this week's work.

Next Monday, the House will convene at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' office by the end of this week. Any votes called on those measures that Members are given notice of will be rolled until 6:30 p.m. on Monday.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider several bills under a rule. First of all, the Science and Departments of Commerce, State and Justice Appropriation Act for fiscal year 2006. Following that, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006; and then, finally, H.R. 2745, the United Nations Reform Act.

I yield back to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

First, if the distinguished whip knows, my presumption is, based upon the schedule that has been submitted, that the probability is we will not have votes on Friday next. Is that a reasonable assumption, do you think, for our Members to make?

Mr. BLUNT. Certainly based on the experience we have had for the last three Fridays, the cooperation of both the ranking member and the leadership of the chairman and the subcommittee chairmen on the appropriations committee, we have been seeing this work go a little faster than we had anticipated. That could happen again next Friday.

The experience again of the last three Fridays would lead one to believe that, but next week we will adopt the same approach. We will get this work done early if we can but would advise Members to plan to be here on Friday because we will want to complete the entire agenda that we have laid out for next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us, with respect to the appropriations bills, which day of the week, Tuesday and thereafter, you might expect each of the individual bills to come up in particular?

Of course, the defense appropriations bill is of great interest to our Members.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I believe we will do those in the order that they appeared starting on Tuesday. So I would expect Tuesday's work to include the Science, Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations Act, and then move on to defense appropriations on Wednesday if we are completed with the previous bill, and then to bring the bill to the floor on United Nations reform after that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I note, Mr. Whip, that the intelligence authorization bill, which was scheduled to be on the floor today, which had been pulled, is not on the schedule for next week.

That obviously is a very important bill. And it is, I would say to my friend, as I understand it, a bill which has the agreement between the chairman of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking Democrat on the Intelligence Committee. So it would seem to be a bipartisan agreement on the substance of the bill. Can the whip tell us when we might see that bill back?

I am sure you agree it is a very important bill, providing for the work of the national intelligence director and providing to make sure that we can keep this country safe from terrorists, and I know that both sides are hopeful that it will come forward pretty quickly.

Can the gentleman tell us when that might be on the floor?

Mr. BLUNT. I would say, in response, that, interestingly, the discussion on that bill, it is an important discussion, is largely between the new Director of National Intelligence and the Armed Services chairman because of some commitments that seemed to have been made and I think were made during the adoption of the 9/11 bill of things that would be included in this bill.

That discussion is going on. We are going to work hard to do everything we can to facilitate a final and complete understanding between the administration and the House on the issues that they are discussing right now. It involves military intelligence and some commitments and discussions that were conducted last year before we moved forward with what was called at that time the 9/11 bill that created the National Intelligence Director's job and did a number of other things to achieve those goals that the whip just mentioned in terms of securing our country in every way that we can.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the whip for the information.

It may be helpful to know that I believe on our side of the aisle, we believe that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN's) agreement was appropriate in the sense that the flexibility be given to the National Intelligence Director to provide for the best possible personnel assignment

with reference to maintaining our security and intelligence apparatus in the most effective mode would be correct, if that is of any help to the whip as he considers the support that that proposition may have on the floor.

I realize there are those on his side of the aisle who have some concerns about it. I understand that the Secretary of Defense may have some concern about it. But I think, frankly, I would hope that a very substantial majority of the House would agree both with the Republican chairman of the Intelligence Committee and the Democratic ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

The gentleman does not have to comment on that, but I thought that it might be useful information for him.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, if I could comment, I would say that we are eager to reach a final understanding on this. But, also, we are eager to be sure that whatever commitments were made and were reached between the administration and the chairman of a significant committee in the House are fully understood and fully complied with. You know, there can be misunderstandings in these kind of discussions, certainly, but we want to be sure that any commitments made by the administration to the Congress and the chairman of its significant committees are fulfilled and, if there are misunderstandings, to be sure that those misunderstandings are worked out before we move forward.

I assure the gentleman that we will be encouraging in that discussion and facilitating it in every way that we can so that it moves forward at the quickest possible time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I will ask one more question on the intelligence issue. Does the gentleman know whether the administration is supportive of the position taken by the chairman of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking Democrat on the Intelligence Committee or not? Has the administration taken a position on that?

□ 1330

Mr. BLUNT. I do not know what their position on that is. Again, I am most concerned that we be sure that we understood our positions when commitments were made when that bill was passed that created the National Intelligence Director's position.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Lastly, we just had a vote on the privileged resolution that was offered by the Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). That resolution, as you know, sought to try to move the ethics process forward so the Ethics Committee could do its work. Hopefully, all of us believe that it is very important that the Ethics Committee be able to undertake its work.

I would hope that the majority would take steps to perhaps discuss in a bipartisan way the implementation of

the existing rules which we believe, as you know, require a majority vote for the hiring of a staff director. That is the way it has always been. From our perspective, that is the way it was intended to be. So it would be a bipartisan or, better yet, nonpartisan handling of the responsibility of the Ethics Committee.

I would hope that in the near term, next week and the days thereafter, that we would work together to try to get this moving forward. Because I think it is important to both sides of the aisle, it is important to the integrity of the House, and I think it is important to the American people.

Mr. BLUNT. I would say it would be hard to be more disappointed than I am that this committee has only met once because of continuing concerns. From the point of view of the majority, I am sure it is our view that we removed what we thought were the obstacles of this committee moving forward with its work, only to find that there is another obstacle. And we do need this committee to work, but all sides need to be looking for ways to make the committee work, not to just find the reasons that the committee does not work, which is my view of this. And we clearly want this committee to work, need this committee to work, and I think the majority has made substantial efforts both publicly and privately to create an opportunity where this committee could do its job.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and I have no doubt about his sincerity in that desire. I would simply observe that had we had the opportunity to debate the privileged resolution, which really seeks to redress the House's positions, that perhaps we could have explored more broadly the differences that exist as they relate to the staffing of the committee. Both sides apparently believe that they are correct in their interpretation, but hopefully both sides want a bipartisan and not a partisan staff to proceed with its work.

Unless the gentleman wanted to say something, I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate what the whip has said and would only say that we could vote on this and solve it that way, but I assume that would not present the right solution as well.

Mr. HOYER. I think the gentleman is probably correct, and of course the resolution offered did not resolve the question. We understand that. But I think the gentleman is correct, it would not resolve it any more than the vote on the rules in January resolved the changing of the rules and the feeling that they were not appropriate to provide the context in which we could proceed.

I know that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) very honestly and sincerely, as I do, wants to see this matter resolved and see the committee move forward so it could become a matter of history and not a matter of

current debate so we can focus on the important issues confronting this country.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2005

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2745, UNITED NATIONS REFORM ACT OF 2005

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet next week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2745, the United Nations Reform Act of 2005. The bill was introduced on June 7, 2005, and referred to the Committee on International Relations which ordered the bill reported yesterday and is expected to file its report with the House tomorrow.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 14. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on International Relations. Members are advised that the text of the bill will be available for their review on the Web sites of both the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### EXPRESSING THE IMPORTANCE OF IMMEDIATELY REOPENING THE FAMOUS BEARTOOTH ALL-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 309) expressing the importance of immediately reopening the famous Beartooth All-American Highway from Red Lodge, Montana, to Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, although I am not going to, I would like to sincerely thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) of the Committee on Resources and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I am sincerely grateful that they were willing to move this through on a unanimous consent as quickly as possible.

A crisis has occurred in Montana one more time. It seems like it is feast or famine for us. We were just going into our eighth year of drought, no rain, well beyond the opportunity to recover. And the prediction was it was going to take as much as 16 feet of snow in the mountain to get us caught up in the moisture. We began getting the rains and, unfortunately, the next thing that happened were mudslides closing off the Beartooth Pass.

Some Members might remember the Beartooth Pass was considered to be the crown jewel on the part of Charles Kuralt. As he traveled around the 50 States, he made the determination that of the 50 States that was the most beautiful part of the entire Nation. I am sure there are a lot of Members in this audience that might object to that definition. But if you look at the recorded list that he put together, the Beartooth Pass was something special.

Feast or famine in that area is nothing new. Cooke City, unfortunately, was the site of the 1988 fires in Yellowstone Park. Unfortunately, a forest fire came down within hundreds of feet of the community. They were able to withstand that economic devastation. This is going to create another economic devastation.

The detour that is going to be required to get to the community of Cooke City until this road is reopened probably is about the size of Illinois by the time you get around that detour. It is not just like taking a different route. It is like taking several different States. I know my colleague, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), and my colleagues, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER), know the importance of Yellowstone Park to the

economy of our region. So we really need it.

The sense of urgency shown on the part of the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO) just cannot be underestimated, and I thank the gentleman for that.

This severely impacts the economy of Carbon County, of Red Lodge, of Cooke City, of Billings, the surrounding area. It is going to be a very complicated fix because it is a switch back. If you have not been there, it ends at the top at about 10,000 feet, a chain of lakes, it is flat, and it is the north entrance to Yellowstone Park. As the mudslides occurred, it took several layers of that switchback out. I think the estimate I heard was about 500 tons of material are sitting on that road.

I will be flying that on Saturday by helicopter, taking a look at the devastation, but it has been an incredible effort, a community effort on the part of the Federal, State, and local jurisdictions as well as the communities coming together.

Again, I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO) for giving us the opportunity to move this very quickly.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REHBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to thank the chairman and encourage passage of this resolution.

The Beartooth Highway connects two cities in Montana, but it passes through Wyoming; and many people need to travel on the Beartooth Highway in order to get into Yellowstone National Park. For many, many years this highway has been sorely neglected. It is not safe in its current condition, but it has not been safe for a long time.

Yellowstone National Park is the crown gem of the park system, and it is important to the whole country. So this is something that the country needs to do at this time. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REHBERG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, during the days of May 16 and May 17 of this year, devastating mudslides bisected six sections of the scenic Beartooth All-American Highway between Red Lodge, Montana and Yellowstone National Park. Consequently, visitors to Yellowstone National Park coming from the States of Montana and Wyoming are now and for the foreseeable future required to take a detour to get to the northeast entrance of our Nation's oldest park. This detour could be in place for the entire summer season. Annually, an average of 190,000 visitors come to the park through the northeast entrance.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution acknowledges the importance of the highway in accessing the park and requests that the President take all necessary action

to assist the State of Montana in reopening the road.

I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) for allowing this bill to be scheduled. The following is an exchange of letters with him:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, June 9, 2005.

Hon. DON YOUNG,  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 2165 Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter dated 9 June 2005 regarding House Resolution 309. I appreciate your willingness to allow the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to be discharged to allow it to be considered on the Floor today. I will include a copy of your letter and my response to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during deliberations on the bill.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. POMBO,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,  
Washington, DC, June 9, 2005.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,  
Chairman, Committee on Resources,  
1324 Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdiction interest of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in matters being considered in H. Res. 309, expressing the importance of immediately reopening the Beartooth All-American Highway from Red Lodge, Montana, to Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming. As you know, the legislation was also referred to the Transportation Committee.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H. Res. 309 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously to the House Floor. Therefore, I am willing to have the Transportation Committee discharged from consideration of the resolution. I would appreciate if it you would include a copy of this letter and your response to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,  
Chairman.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) for working with me to move this resolution so quickly through the House.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman not only for his sense of urgency but his kind consideration in letting me go out of turn in my statement. I thank the chairman. I thank the House of Representatives for its positive consideration of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 309

Whereas on March 1, 1872, Yellowstone was established as the world's first national park;

Whereas Yellowstone National Park encompasses over 2 million acres and is one of America's Crown Jewels of the National Park System;

Whereas over 2.8 million people visit Yellowstone National Park annually to admire its world famous geysers, hot springs, and remarkable wildlife, and to hike its more than 950 miles of backcountry trails;

Whereas on May 16-17, 2005, a major mudslide bisected the scenic Beartooth Highway in 6 sections requiring visitors from Montana to undertake a detour to the Northeast Entrance to Yellowstone National Park;

Whereas the scenic Beartooth Highway provides on average 190,000 visitors annually easy access to the Northeast Entrance to Yellowstone National Park;

Whereas the scenic Beartooth Highway has been recognized as one of the most scenic drives in the United States; and

Whereas the scenic Beartooth Highway is the economic artery for the citizens of the gateway communities of Red Lodge, Cooke City, and Silver Gate, Montana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the critical importance of ensuring unfettered access to visitors of Yellowstone National Park and preserving the economy of Red Lodge, Montana; and

(2) urges the President to take, without hesitation, all necessary actions to assist the Governor of Montana in reopening, as quickly as possible, the scenic Beartooth Highway that provides access to Yellowstone National Park.

The resolution is agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HONORING HOUSE PAGES

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the page class of 2005 to come down and take seats in the first two rows. While we are doing that, I would like to yield to my colleague and friend, the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is on a time crunch and always likes to say good-bye to our page class.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, and I thank him for the work that he does with the Page Board. His leadership and faithfulness in this effort is very much appreciated, I know, by these young people but appreciated also by the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

I always like to have this opportunity to thank you young people. You have had an extraordinary opportunity which millions and millions of those your age will never have. You have had an opportunity to see firsthand the operations of the people's House, the House that was established by our Founding Fathers to reflect, as they viewed it, the passions of the people from time to time. That is why we have 2-year elections.

□ 1345

That is why the only way you can serve in the House of Representatives is to be elected. You cannot be appointed. You can be appointed to the

U.S. Senate. You can be appointed Vice President of the United States, but you cannot be appointed to the House of Representatives.

You have had an opportunity on a day-to-day basis to help us make sure that democracy works. You may not think of what you did as high falutin and it perhaps was not, but it was critical to the functioning of this House.

I would ask you as you leave here to leave with a sense of responsibility, a sense of responsibility to convey to your classmates, to your friends in your neighborhood, to your future college classes, your future workers, co-workers, and your families and others and your fellow citizens your view of democracy as it is represented in this House. It is, of course, not perfect, because it is, obviously, human beings that participate in this, and as I know all of you know too well, we humans are not perfect.

However, as Winston Churchill said, while it may not be perfect, it is better than all other forms of government that have been tried. And I have been here now, this is my 26th year. You were born during part of my fifth or sixth term in office. As president of the Maryland Senate, I had the opportunity to run the page program in Maryland, and I always hoped that they would go back and say, you know what, they care, they care about our country, they care about us. They disagree. There are deep divisions from time to time, but, for the most part, almost everyone is trying to represent what they believe to be the best interests of their country.

Therefore, you will urge your fellow citizens to participate in the process, as hopefully you will as well. Having more knowledge than they, the more you participate, the better our democracy will be.

So I thank you for your service, not only on behalf of myself but on behalf of the Democratic Members of this House. There is no partisanship in the respect and affection that we have for all of you outstanding young people who make us proud of the generations that are coming and are confident that our country will be better for your future service and your service now.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving me this opportunity, and I thank him for his leadership of this page board. Good luck.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I will submit the roster of the 2005 pages for the RECORD at this point.

#### SPRING 2005 PAGES

Katy Ake—CA  
Paul Bennett—FL  
Rachel Bentley—OH  
Emily Berger—CA  
Katharine Billingslea—NC  
Lauren Boswell—MD  
Suzanne Brangan—TX  
Stephen Burke—NJ  
Kerianna Butler—CA  
Jon Calvo—GU  
Elsbeth Centola—OR  
Joy Chung—IA  
Daniel Ciucci—CO

Stella Clingmon—CA  
Stephanie Collard—RI  
Juleah Cordi—CA  
Matthew Cujak—WI  
Awapuhi Dancil—HI  
Ruben Davis—PA  
Lauren DeNunez—CA  
Caroline Dickerson—TX  
Edward Dumoulin—IL  
Timothy Ford—MI  
Adam Hammond—ID  
Lane Hartley—VA  
Alexandra Heard—MD  
Lauren Henley—IL  
Allison Holmer—CA  
Amanda Huth—TX  
Sarah Jaeschke—AR  
Derek Jennarone—NJ  
Holly Johnson—VA  
Krystal Johnson—AL  
Jaclyn Kahn—NJ  
Rosemary Kelley—VA  
Zachary Kiriha—CA  
Dean Ladin—IL  
Thomas Leonard—PA  
Peter Linscheid—MI  
Seth Lloyd—VI  
Anthony Lupo—CA  
Tyson McBride—UT  
Caitlin McGowan—MN  
Conor McManus—FL  
Shannon Magnuson—FL  
Jeremy Moore—MI  
Chelsie Morales—AZ  
Richard Moses—KY  
Lucy Nicholas—CT  
Darren Nowels—MD  
Travis Proctor—KS  
Danielle Raines—AZ  
Rachel Romer—CO  
Taylor Salisbury—MO  
Matthew Sheldon—NM  
Sara Skiles—MS  
Kellie Staab—PA  
Elizabeth Stone—TN  
Joshua Strazanac—MI  
Michael Trummel—WY  
Dustin Tryggstad—WI  
Allison Vanderboll—WA  
Sarah Walker—AR  
Whitley Wallace—UT  
Ginger Wells—KS  
Wesley Williams—MA  
David Wilson—PA  
Kevin Wood—TX

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), the delegate from Guam, to address you, as she has a special person here from the territory.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Jon Junior Calvo for his service as a congressional page in the United States House of Representatives. Jon is graduating from the congressional page program on June 10, 2005. It is exciting that his parents, Juan and Doris Calvo, and two of his siblings, Jonathan and Joni Ree, were able to come all the way from Guam, 10,000 miles from Washington, D.C., to celebrate this occasion with us. Celebrating with us here in spirit is his sister Krisinda.

The congressional page program brings together a diverse group of outstanding student leaders from around the country to work in Congress and pursue their studies in the Nation's Capital. It fuses classroom learning with real-world work experience, giving students like Jon a front row seat as history unfolds.

I nominated Jon based upon his strong academic record, his dem-

onstrated commitment to public service, and for his character and leadership in the community. He has lived up to and even exceeded my very high expectations for him.

Jon is the kind of young person that lights up a room when he walks into it and makes a lasting impression on everyone he meets. In his first month in the program, Jon was recognized with a citizenship award that is given to one exceptional student in the program each month. Other Members of Congress have even remarked to me on the floor what an outstanding young person Jon is.

Jon has been extremely active in the page program, serving on the yearbook staff and handling the public relations for the 2005 spring page class play, "The Black Rose." While in Washington, D.C., he was also elected incoming president of the National Honor Society chapter at Father Duenas Memorial School in Guam, where he will complete his studies next year.

I have enjoyed Jon's frequent visits to our office, and we always try and have a little taste of home for him when he stops by, whether it is guyuria, Chamorro chip cookies or red rice.

I thought that coming from Guam Jon might have a rough time adjusting to Washington, D.C.'s, cold winter weather, but I think he actually enjoyed the snow and the ice.

Jon has been an excellent ambassador for the people of Guam during his time here in Washington, spreading the "hafa adai" spirit throughout the halls of Congress. As a native speaker of Guam's indigenous language, Chamorro, Jon is a role model and example to other young people in Guam of the importance of preserving one's culture and one's language.

I always enjoy seeing Jon's friendly face on the House floor, and he calls us to let us know that he is going to be on C-SPAN. He will be truly missed when he returns home to Guam. I am sure that I will still see a lot of Jon, though, considering how active he is in the community through his church and school.

Jon is a young man of many talents, and I am excited to see what he will do in life. Whatever he does, I am sure he will continue making a positive contribution to our island.

Before I close, I would like to say congratulations to all the wonderful pages that have come from all over the States in our Nation. You have been a wonderful group of people.

Jon, you have made your family, your church, your school and the people of Guam proud. Si Yu'os Ma'ase for your service, and God bless you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, this always gives me an opportunity to bounce back and forth between the podiums because this is really a special time. I will get a chance to address you all tomorrow at the departure ceremony, which will be a first for me, although being with the page program

for a long time. The work and effort that you have put in, you know what you have done, and we really thank you for your efforts and the sacrifice you have made.

You have heard now from two Members of Congress. There are Members who you know who always pay a little closer attention to the pages because of love and admiration, maybe a history in the program, and we have one of those with us. I would invite him to come up and say his good-byes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me. And it is true, I have a very special affection for the page program. I think many of you know it is because I was a page. That is how I got started. Most of you also know the dirty little secret that it was as a Senate page, that I was over on the other side there. That is okay. I was still in the page program.

It was a very special moment in my life to have spent the time that I did here, 3 years. In those days, you could come anytime in your high school years and stay as long as your sponsor would let you stay, as long as you could keep up your grades so that you did not flunk out and leave, and you got to stay around here. I did, and I graduated from the page school. So I know what a difference it has made in my life.

I guess you could say here I am today, I cannot say that the page program propelled me to Congress itself. The vast majority of you will not ever serve in government at all or in elected office perhaps, but I think some of you will. There is no question about that. Some of you will, and you will be very successful at all the things you do. But whether or not you go into government, whether or not you run for office or you enter some other kind of position in the government or go into business or a profession, I think you will find that this experience will stand you in very, very, very good stead.

You will find that not only does it give you kind of a sense of understanding of the government, which is going to impact your life. It does not matter what line of work you go into. Government is going to impact your life, and you are going to have a better understanding than the majority of people because you will have been there and watched it and/or observed for a semester or two semesters.

It gives you a sense of camaraderie or sense of independence at an earlier age than most young people get a chance to be as independent. It gives you a sense of discipline. You learn a lot of discipline skills. You do not have a parent there at night to study, to do the things that you need to do.

I think that the most interesting thing about the page program as I have observed it over the 20 years, 21 years now I have been here in Congress, and a number of those I served as the predecessor to the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. SHIMKUS) as the chairman of the page board, and it was certainly one of the more enjoyable experiences that I have had here in Congress, what I observed is that each class of pages has its own personality and develops its own personality.

So I am not sure exactly how I would describe the personality of this class except I would say maybe I do not know you very well. I would say it is a little more serious than some of the other classes I have seen, a little more reserved, more serious. Maybe that is good. That does not mean it is all bad. I know it is probably not that way back in the dorm in the evenings and not that way on the weekends with you, but I do think this is a class that has had a great deal of seriousness, watched a great deal of things happen here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I think you deserve a great appreciation for that.

There have been classes, of course, that preceded you just 2 or 3 years ago that experienced the incredible experience of 9/11, of going through that horrific Tuesday morning with so many others of us here. Each page class has its own kind of experiences that it has, but I just want you to know that you are not only appreciated for what you do, but in a very real sense we could not do this job if it were not for you. You really are the grease that make the place just run a little bit more smoothly. You are what make us all feel just a little bit better.

There are other people that could do the job. There is no question about it. We could hire people to do this job. And yet, with a considerable effort and even expense because of maintaining a school, maintaining a dormitory and all the things that have to be done, the question is often asked in the Congress, I have to tell you, and certainly by some constituents, why do we do this and keep this program? I think the answer is right here in front of me. Because of all of you and because of what we see here and because of what you have learned from this and what you have been able to do with this and what I know you will do with this and how I know this experience will and can be a life-changing experience.

Every year in the summer of another group, we can give 70, 75 people to have this kind of experience. It is a very extraordinary experience for you, and I think we have changed your lives and you will go out and touch a lot of other lives, older people, younger people and your peers as well, as you go through life.

So, again, we thank you for the wonderful job that you have done. We want to say farewell but not really farewell. We expect to see you back often and hear from you. You have always watched as the former pages come into the cloakrooms and onto the floor when we are not in session, and so you will be among those. It will be a very special experience for you to be able to come back and observe the younger

pages that are here in the following years.

So thank you for the wonderful service you have given us. I want to wish you all very well in your final year of school and the year of school that goes beyond that, because I know all of you are going to be successful in whatever you do. Godspeed. Thank you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on my 1 minute today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, the ranking member of the page program is the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who has been on the program for decades now. I will not say how many decades. And he has been a great help to me in keeping the current environment and the future of the page program grounded to the traditions of the previous classes. He could not stay to talk and address you all, but he did provide me with his comments, and I will submit those for the RECORD along with your names.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a colleague who would like to address the class.

□ 1400

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, thank you for picking and selecting such a great group of young people. I am proud that I have gotten to know you a little bit. I am so motherly when I run into you on the elevators, I see so many of the faces I have asked where are you from, how are you liking this and asked question, question, question. And you have been so patient and polite with me, and thank you very much.

Part of growing up is knowing you have to be polite to adults, and you hope when you are an adult people will be polite with you, particularly pages in the House of Representatives because you represent our entire Nation and our territories. You bring such a perfect, beautiful face to this. Every one of you, you look like the country. That is good for us, and it is good for you, and it is certainly good for the diversity of democracy that we uphold here.

I have learned from you, and I think you have learned from us and are taking a lot back; but at the same time you have contributed so much.

Do not think for a minute you are just here taking. You gave. We know that and appreciate that, and maybe we have not always let you know how much we appreciate you, but we do. Good luck, good future, and congratulations for being just exactly the people you are. Thank you.



Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. The pages have given to this institution and the page program. You have set a bar by which we can now challenge other page classes, and I want to thank you.

Mr. Speaker, also joining us is the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for all of his work with the page program. I want to thank all of the pages for their service and take a moment to brag a little because Stella is from my district. I know how great Stella is, and I know you know how great she is. We were so delighted to have her join us. She has added a great deal to the page class, including directing the play "The Black Rose." Stella's folks are here today and are going on a tour. So please say hello to them. We are proud of the work you did and the work all of you did.

Mr. Speaker, I had a chance during college to intern here on Capitol Hill twice. It was a different experience than the page experience, but I hope many of you will come back as interns, as staff, and ultimately come back as Members of the House. And if you are lucky, you can become lords in the Senate and then we will have to show even greater respect to all of you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the pages very much for their work. It is tremendously appreciated. I want to wish you, Stella, and wish the entire class all the best of luck.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to steal some thunder from some of the words I will mention tomorrow afternoon and tomorrow evening, but you know what you have been doing and you know the role you have played here and the friends you have made and the relationships you have built. You take a unique quality back with you.

As a former high school history teacher, it is not the book learning; you have actually lived it. You are now some of the most informed people in the operating of the House of Representatives from the whole congressional district in which you reside. You know truth from fiction. You know, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, that people come here well intentioned to do the best job they can for their districts. You have seen the debates, and you have run out of the Capitol. You understand the environment we live in here, that representatives try to balance a thousand balls in the air at one time, and you have had to do that, too.

I am also speaking here for the floor staff on both sides of the aisle who have worked with you diligently, and you have worked with them, whether it is the school program which I applaud you on and your efforts in that respect, or it is the dorm staff. You truly have been a class that many of the people you have had to work with over the past year are honestly saying that they are going to miss you. I cannot think

of a better tribute to pay to a group of young men and women, than for those, especially adults that you have had to work with for over a year, to say I am going to miss that class.

Mr. Speaker, these pages have set the bar. We will challenge the incoming classes to try to meet their high standard. I hope they do. I hope we will continue to be better for that.

This period of time is in honor of the pages. You will get to celebrate with your families tomorrow night, say your good-byes and make America stronger by having well-informed young women and young men to get back into the everyday activities of our homes and how to make our country better. Thank you, God bless you all, and God bless the United States of America.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all of the pages who have served so diligently in the House of Representatives during the 109th Congress. I have attached a list of the fine young people who have served this House as Pages.

We all recognize the important role that congressional pages play in helping the U.S. House of Representatives operate. This group of young people, who come from all across our Nation, represent what is good about our country.

To become a page, these young people have proven themselves to be academically qualified. They have ventured away from the security of their homes and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. Through this experience, they have witnessed a new culture, made new friends, and learned the details of how our Government operates.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and energy.

In addition, they must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people at a personal level. At the same time, they face a challenging academic schedule of classes in the House Page School.

I am sure they will consider their time spent in Washington, DC to be one of the most valuable and exciting experiences of their lives, and that with this experience they will all move ahead to lead successful and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, as the Democratic Member on the House Page Board, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this group of distinguished young Americans. They certainly will be missed.

#### SPRING 2005 PAGES

Katy Ake—CA  
Paul Bennett—FL  
Rachel Bentley—OH  
Emily Berger—CA  
Katharine Billingslea—NC  
Lauren Boswell—MD  
Suzanne Brangan—TX  
Stephen Burke—NJ  
Kerrianna Butler—CA  
Jon Calvo—GU  
Elsbeth Centola—OR  
Joy Chung—IA  
Daniel Ciucci—CO  
Stella Clingmon—CA  
Stephanie Collard—RI  
Juleah Cordi—CA  
Matthew Cujak—WI  
Awapuhi Dancil—HI

Ruben Davis—PA  
Lauren DeNunez—CA  
Caroline Dickerson—TX  
Edward Dumoulin—IL  
Timothy Ford—MI  
Adam Hammond—ID  
Lane Hartley—VA  
Alexandra Heard—MD  
Lauren Henley—IL  
Allison Holmer—CA  
Amanda Huth—TX  
Sarah Jaeschke—AR  
Derek Jannarone—NJ  
Holly Johnson—VA  
Krystal Johnson—AL  
Jaclyn Kahn—NJ  
Rosemary Kelley—VA  
Zachary Kiriha—CA  
Dean Ladin—IL  
Thomas Leonard—PA  
Peter Linscheid—MI  
Seth Lloyd—VI  
Anthony Lupo—CA  
Tyson McBride—UT  
Caitlin McGowan—MN  
Conor McManus—FL  
Shannon Magnuson—FL  
Jeremy Moore—MI  
Chelsie Morales—AZ  
Richard Moses—KY  
Lucy Nicholas—CT  
Darren Nowels—MD  
Travis Proctor—KS  
Danielle Raines—AZ  
Rachel Romer—CO  
Taylor Salisbury—MO  
Matthew Sheldon—NM  
Sara Skiles—MS  
Kellie Staab—PA  
Elizabeth Stone—TN  
Joshua Strazanac—MI  
Michael Trummel—WY  
Dustin Tryggstad—WI  
Allison Vanderboll—WA  
Sarah Walker—AR  
Whitley Wallace—UT  
Ginger Wells—KS  
Wesley Williams—MA  
David Wilson—PA  
Kevin Wood—TX

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### THREAT TO OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times on this floor concerning the need to secure our borders. We must do so if we are going to have any kind of responsible immigration policy and retain our national sovereignty. We know with somewhere between 36,000 and 50,000 additional enforcement personnel on our southern borders, we can catch virtually all of the potential terrorists and drug dealers trying to enter this country illegally.

But we now find that other-than-Mexican illegals, or OTMs as they are referred to by our Border Patrol, have discovered a large loophole in our law. Under this loophole, OTMs can cross our border illegally and be apprehended by our border patrol. The border patrol is then forced to give them paperwork allowing them to bypass all other immigration checkpoints and virtually release them into our country.

This criminal scheme is not the fault of some quirk in U.S. law. It is being forced on our border patrol by international law which we are allowing to undermine our rule of law, national immigration policy, our Constitution, and our sovereignty. International law says illegal immigrants must either be deported to their country of origin or placed in detention. If there is no room in detention, they must be released on bail with a promise that they return later for trial.

There is never any room in detention any more for the millions of illegals violating our southern border every year. And since these illegals are not Mexican, our border patrol is required to buy them airfare back to Brazil, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, China, Iraq, and on and on. So they sign an agreement to show in court in 30 days and are released.

With that paper in hand, they can pass legally through all other border patrol checkpoints and vanish into cities in America. We have caught 90,000 OTMs since October 1, 2004, and 98 percent have failed to show back up in court. Once hidden in large immigration communities inside our country with new false identification, it becomes virtually impossible to apprehend them.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood here before and called for deploying 36,000 troops to our border to effectively close it. But with this situation in place, we could send 1 million troops to our borders, and it would not make any difference. Border patrol says these people swim across the Rio Grande and come looking for our officers with a demand "permiso," for the warrant that gives them a free pass into our Nation illegally.

Mr. Speaker, we need a new law right now. Anyone who crosses our border with Mexico illegally should be considered a citizen of Mexico for enforcement purposes. They should be returned there or incarcerated here immediately. This is not the United Nations or WTO. We represent the people

of our districts. We are responsible to the people of the United States and are sworn to defend our Constitution. We have an inherent God-given right to national sovereignty, and this House must not stand by while foreign nations undermine our laws and our independence.

Mr. Speaker, I will be back next week to further this conversation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### SMART SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 at Fort Hood, Texas, President Bush told an audience of thousands of servicemembers that for the first time Iraqi soldiers outnumbered U.S. soldiers in Iraq. That was April 12. Specifically, he put the number of trained and equipped Iraqi forces at 150,000.

This rosy assessment of the situation in Iraq is shocking not only for its arrogance but also for its ignorance. The President was either totally oblivious to Iraq's true security failures, or he was intentionally misleading the American people into thinking peace has taken hold. His statement was uninformed at best, deceitful at worst. Either way, the President's assessment misleads the American people in knowing the true situation in Iraq.

Take, for example, his claim that 150,000 Iraqi soldiers have been trained. Iraq's military leaders reveal the number is closer to 75,000, half of the President's statement; and we are not sure what the quality of training is and how those trained individuals are measured.

Also, the actual number of trained security personnel committed to a secure and democratic Iraq is probably less because, as the chief of police in Basra, General Hassan al-Sade stated, at least half of his 14,000-member militia is openly opposed to a secure Iraq, and another quarter are politically neutral but do not follow his military orders. General al-Sade recently told the Guardian newspaper, "I trust 25 percent of my force, no more."

After giving his Fort Hood speech last April, the President never again

mentioned that 150,000 Iraqi security personnel have been trained. Perhaps that is because he realized his assessment was entirely inaccurate; but the President never admitted to the American people that he was wrong in his assessment, and he has still not told the American people when he will determine Iraq to be secure or how and when he plans to bring the troops home.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to secure Iraq is to remove U.S. troops from the country. Nothing enrages and unites the Iraq insurgency more than the presence of nearly 150,000 American soldiers on Iraqi soil. One option is to bring one American soldier home for every Iraqi soldier that has been trained. If 75,000 Iraqi soldiers have been trained, half of the President's April 12 assessment, why can we not remove the same number of our own soldiers and bring them home? This is just one idea for exiting Iraq. I encourage the President to come up with his own plan. I am not against supporting the President's plan if it is a good one, but right now he does not even have a plan.

Fortunately, there is a plan that would secure America for the future, SMART security. SMART is Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism for the 21st century.

□ 1415

SMART will help us address the threats we face as a Nation. SMART security will prevent acts of terrorism in countries like Iraq by addressing the very conditions which allow terrorism to take root: poverty, despair, resource scarcity and lack of educational opportunities. SMART security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address pressing global issues. SMART addresses global crises diplomatically rather than resorting to armed conflict. Efforts to help give Iraq back to the Iraqis must follow the SMART approach: humanitarian assistance, coordinated with our international allies, to rebuild Iraq's war-torn physical and economic infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 2 years since the United States started this war in Iraq; and now the American people, especially the soldiers who are bravely serving our country halfway around the world, need and deserve a plan for ending this war. It is time for the President to create a plan to end the war in Iraq and to bring our troops home.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). The Chair will remind all Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President. Policies may be addressed in critical terms, but personal references such as accusations of mendacity are not in order.

## THE GREATEST GENERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most monumental battles of World War II took place in October of 1944 in the Pacific theater in the Battle of Leyte Gulf. One of those heroes who fought on Hell's doorstep in this battle was Major Alan McKean. Major McKean served in the United States Army and was among the millions of others who answered freedom's call in the largest armed conflict in recorded history.

When we consider generations of our past, no one exemplifies the essence of America better than those, part of what we now call the greatest generation. For this generation of Americans, like Major McKean, whose character and resolve was molded by the Great Depression, defeating Adolf Hitler and the Axis powers' reign of terror was just another call to answer. They performed their duty with honor. It was not theirs to question. It was simply expected. We will never forget their triumphs, and we will never forget those victories like the battle of Leyte Gulf which came at such a great cost. Few causes were as worthy. Few prices were as great. Perhaps Winston Churchill said it best when he said of this generation, This was their finest hour.

Men like Major McKean saved an entire world from tyranny and gave people the chance to live under flags of freedom by answering the call to service. To this day and forever, we recall these heroic deeds and we remember and honor those who liberated the world.

Like the soldiers of America's greatest generation, today's service men and women are in distant lands fighting the threat and horror of terror by spreading freedom and making our homeland more secure. America will continue to honor our past and present military because the triumph of its ideals resides in the actions of its heroes. I salute Major Alan McKean and all the service men and women who put themselves in harm's way so that we may live in freedom.

May God bless America, may He bless Major Alan McKean and his wife Dorothy, and may He hold them in the palm of His hand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## THE ROAD NOT TAKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, last month dozens of world leaders, including President Bush, gathered in Moscow to celebrate the 60th anniversary of V-E day. It was fitting and proper for the President and other heads of state to pay homage to the millions who died defeating Nazism and fascism and to commemorate the end of the Second World War.

The year 1945 also marked the beginning of the nuclear age, and even those who had become inured to the destruction that years of fighting had wrought were stunned by the devastation caused by the atomic bombs dropped on Japan. Nuclear weapons have been the dominant feature of the international security landscape ever since, and preventing their proliferation has been a central goal of American Presidents from Harry Truman to George W. Bush.

That is why I cannot understand the failure of the administration to take a leading role at the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty review conference that was held at the United Nations from May 2-27. There is near unanimity among policymakers and our Nation's political leadership that nuclear terrorism and the proliferation of nuclear weapons are the greatest threats to our national security. The President has said so himself. But the United States did not dispatch any senior officials to New York and downplayed the importance of the conference. This was shortsighted and dangerous, and the failure to achieve any concrete results at the NPT conference was a major national security setback for the United States as well as for the rest of the world.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which took effect in 1970, has for the most part been successful in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons beyond the original five members of the nuclear club, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, China and the United States. In 1960, John Kennedy wrote that he expected 20 nations would have nuclear weapons by the end of the 1960s. He considered this the gravest threat to world peace and set in motion the events and discussions that culminated in the NPT.

During the 35 years that the treaty has been in effect, only three nations are known to have developed nuclear weapons, India, Pakistan and Israel, and they are not parties to the NPT. North Korea is believed to have a handful of nuclear weapons, and Iran is engaged in a diplomatic game of chicken with the West in its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, after three and a half decades, the NPT is showing its age, and the review conference was held at a critical time for the international community's efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. In December of last year, a panel of experts convened by the U.N. issued a stark warning that we are approaching the point at which

the erosion of the nonproliferation regime could become irreversible and result in a cascade of proliferation. One of the members of that panel was Brent Scowcroft, who served as national security adviser to President George H.W. Bush.

The twin nuclear crises with North Korea and Iran have exposed flaws in the NPT's "grand bargain," which was first articulated in President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" proposal. In exchange for the commitment to forgo the acquisition of nuclear weapons and to agree to international safeguards and inspections, the NPT guarantees non-nuclear weapon states who are parties to the treaty the peaceful development and use of nuclear energy. The problem with this bargain is that it allows nations like Iran or North Korea access to fissile material and technological know-how that is the necessary precursor for a nuclear weapons program. When the state feels confident it is ready to proceed with a weapons program, it simply opts out of the NPT.

Had it chosen to do so, the administration could have used the review conference in New York to make it more difficult for states to access nuclear material and technology under the NPT and then walk away from the treaty by providing tough penalties for those who would try.

One proposal by a group of experts at Princeton and Stanford would bar parties withdrawing from the NPT to use fissile materials or production facilities acquired while they were parties to the treaty to make nuclear weapons. The German government also proposed preventing a party from withdrawing from the treaty if that state was in violation of that treaty.

But reinvigorating the NPT requires more than cracking down on Iran and North Korea. It also demands leadership from the declared nuclear weapons states which as part of the NPT committed themselves to reduce their own stockpiles significantly in exchange for non-nuclear states renouncing nuclear ambitions. Unfortunately, the five nuclear weapons states have not done enough, and General Scowcroft and his colleagues chided them in their report for their lackluster efforts.

Matters have not been helped by a State Department brochure handed out at the conference which listed arms control breakthroughs since the 1980s and touted reductions in the U.S. arsenal. But the time line made no mention of the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a pact negotiated by the Clinton administration and ratified by 121 nations but rejected by this President. The brochure also ignored the 2000 NPT review conference at which the U.S. and other nuclear weapons states committed to practical steps to achieve nuclear safety, including entering into the test ban treaty and negotiation of a fissile material cutoff treaty to ban manufacture and production of additional bomb material.

Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of World War II, the United States constructed a diverse set of international institutions to guarantee peace and better ensure a future for America and the rest of the world. By going to Moscow, President Bush honored the sacrifice of millions of Americans and other allied personnel to secure our present. But it was the road not taken, the one to New York, that would have helped to secure the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SIMMONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOSSELLA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BORDALLO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CLIMATE CHANGE—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss climate change, one of the most important issues facing our planet today. Thankfully, the issue of climate change has been getting more coverage in the national media. While I know that there are many Members in Congress who are committed to taking action, the level of attention paid to climate change in Congress does not match either the urgency of the issue or the concern of the American public. Given the enormous implications for our economy and our environment, this must change. Climate change is real, and we must act.

The steps we must take to address the issue are a matter of great debate. There is a consensus that we must reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but how we do that is not as simple. I applaud my colleagues in the House as well as the Senate who have introduced or supported legislation to address climate change. I have, however, great concern that their proposals, while extremely well-intentioned and well-crafted, do not have sufficient support in the Congress and do not adequately address the economic challenges our country will face as we move toward a less-carbon-intensive economy.

It is my belief that we must take action now to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but we must do so in a way that would minimize the impact to our economy. We must implement an economy-wide, upstream, all greenhouse gas cap-and-trade emissions reduction program that provides some flexibility and a measure of certainty to those industries and businesses affected.

The National Commission on Energy Policy, a bipartisan group of top experts from energy, government, labor, academia and environmental and consumer groups, developed a set of sensible policy recommendations for addressing oil security, climate change, natural gas supply, and other long-term energy supply challenges. They advocate for a modest, certain and efficient proposal. Their recommendations have been endorsed by major U.S. businesses and labor groups.

One of the key components of their proposal is the concept of a safety valve for the cap-and-trade program. The safety valve essentially puts a price on carbon but provides for an unlimited number of allowances to be sold by the government. Since no one would pay more than what the government charges for allowances, this mechanism effectively controls the price of allowances.

□ 1430

When set at the right price, the safety valve would start the country down the path of slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions without causing economic disruption. While there may be less emissions reduction with a safety valve than without one, today we are doing nothing. And the safety valve creates a potential buy-in from those affected by the legislation.

Another component that I believe is important to integrate into any climate change policy is setting a prospective baseline on greenhouse gas emissions. A sound greenhouse gas emissions reduction policy must recognize that the buildup of greenhouse gas has been taking place over the last century. Since greenhouse gas concentrations are a cumulative measure, sharply reducing a particular year's emissions is substantially less important than the alternative, which is to start down the long-term path of gradually slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. This will also allow businesses to plan for a carbon-constrained world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe any climate change policy we implement must also tie our country's efforts to reducing greenhouse gas emissions to those efforts of the major developing countries. We must ensure that they make a similar commitment to our environment and that the United States is not unfairly burdened. It is a major concern of American business and labor that the developing countries participate in slowing the growth of greenhouse gases to a degree comparable to ours. Any program that does not link our emissions reductions to those of the major developing countries would not only be fundamentally unfair but could also reduce America's competitiveness, resulting in the loss of businesses and jobs in the United States.

And, lastly, Mr. Speaker, a climate change policy must also encourage the development of new greenhouse gas emissions reduction technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD two documents to supplement what I have said here today, an editorial and a letter.

The long-term resolution of the greenhouse gas emissions issues lies in the research and development of new technology.

Mr. Speaker, there is irrefutable scientific evidence to justify taking action on climate change. The long-term consequences of failing to act are sufficiently well documented, providing us with every incentive we need to act. I know many of my colleagues believe that the United States can and should adopt a greenhouse gas emissions reduction policy, but I believe that such a policy will only garner support if it is modest, efficient, and fair. Most importantly Mr. Speaker, we must begin the process. We must act and we must do so now. Otherwise, we are simply putting the future of our planet at risk.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 2005]  
A WARMING CLIMATE

For the past four years members of the Bush administration have cast doubt on the scientific community's consensus on climate change. But even if they don't like the science, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, one of their closest allies in Iraq and elsewhere, has given the administration another, more realpolitik, reason to rejoin the climate change debate: "If America wants the rest of the world to be part of the agenda it has set, it must be part of their agenda, too," the prime minister said this week.

Mr. Blair's speech came at an interesting moment, both for the administration's energy and climate change policies and for the administration's diplomatic agenda. In the next few weeks, the House will almost certainly vote once again on last year's energy bill, a mishmash of subsidies and tax breaks that finally proved too expensive even for a Republican Senate to stomach. After a House vote, there may be an attempt to trim the cost of the bill and add measures to make it acceptable to more senators—including the growing number of Republicans who have, sometimes behind the scenes, indicated an interest in climate change legislation.

Indeed, any new discussion of energy policy could allow Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Joseph I. Lieberman (D-Conn.) to seek another vote on their climate change bill, which would establish a domestic "cap and trade" system or controlling the greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming.

If domestic politics could prompt the president to look again at the subject, international politics certainly should. Administration officials assert that mending fences with Europe is a primary goal for this year; if so, the relaunching of a climate change policy—almost any climate change policy—would be widely interpreted as a sign of goodwill, as Mr. Blair made clear. Beyond the problematic Kyoto Protocol, there are ways for the United States to join the global discussion, not least by setting limits for domestic carbon emissions.

Although environmentalists and the business lobby sometimes make it sound as if no climate change compromise is feasible, several informal coalitions in Washington suggest the opposite. The Pew Center on Global Climate Change got a number of large energy companies and consumers—including Shell, Alcoa, DuPont and American Electric Power—to help design the McCain-Lieberman legislation. A number of security hawks have recently joined forces with environmentalists to promote fuel efficiency as a means of reducing U.S. dependence on Middle Eastern oil. Most substantively, the National Commission on Energy Policy, a group that deliberately brought industry, environmental and government experts together to hash out a compromise, recently published its conclusions after two years of debate.

Among other things, it proposed more flexible means of promoting automobile fuel efficiency and suggested determining in advance exactly how high the "price" for carbon emissions should be allowed to go, thereby giving industry some way to predict the ultimate cost of a cap-and-trade system.

They also point out that legislation limiting carbon emissions would immediately create incentives for industry to invent new fuel-efficient technologies, to build new nuclear power plants (nuclear power produces no carbon) and to find cleaner ways to burn coal. Technologies to reduce carbon emissions as well as fossil fuel consumption around the world are within reach, in other

words—if only the United States government wants them.

JUNE 12, 2003.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,  
*Russell Office Building,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOSEPH LIEBERMAN,  
*Hart Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS MCCAIN AND LIEBERMAN: As Congress takes up the issue of market-based systems to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, we are writing to encourage you to incorporate an allowance price cap sometimes referred to as a "safety valve." In the context of a cap-and-trade system for emission allowances, a safety valve would specify a maximum market price at which the government would step in and sell additional allowances to prevent the price from rising any further. Much like the Federal Reserve intervenes in bond and currency markets to protect the economy from adverse macroeconomic shocks, this intervention is designed to protect the economy automatically from adverse energy demand and technology shocks. While we disagree on what steps are necessary in the short run, we both agree it is particularly important to pursue them in a manner that limits economic risk.

Our support for the safety valve stems from the underlying science and economics surrounding the problem of global climate change, and is something that virtually all economists—even two with as politically diverse views as ourselves—can agree upon. It is based on three important facts.

First, unexpected events can easily make the cost of a cap-and-trade program that includes carbon dioxide quite high, even with a modest cap. For example, consider an effort to reduce domestic carbon dioxide emissions by 5% below future forecast levels over the next ten years—to about 1.8 billion tons of carbon. This is in the ballpark of the domestic reductions in the first phase of McCain-Lieberman allowing for offsets, the targets in the Bush climate plan, and the level of domestic emission reductions described by the Clinton administration under its vision of Kyoto implementation. Based on central estimates, the required reductions would amount to about 90 million tons of carbon emissions, and might cost the economy as a whole around \$1.5 billion per year. However, reaching the target could instead require 180 million tons of reductions because of otherwise higher emissions related to a warm summer, a cold winter, or unexpected economic growth. Based on alternative model estimates, it could also cost twice as much to reduce each ton of carbon. The result could be costs that are eight times higher than the best guess.

Second and equally important, the benefits from reduced greenhouse gas emissions have little to do with mission levels in a particular year. Benefits stem from eventual changes in atmospheric concentrations of these gases that accumulate over very long periods of time. Strict adherence to a short-term emission cap is therefore less important from an environmental perspective than the long-term effort to reduce emissions more substantially. Without a safety valve, cap-and-trade risks diverting resources away from those long-term efforts in order to meet a less important short-term target.

Finally, few approaches can protect the economy from the unexpected outcome of higher energy demand and inadequate technology as effectively as a safety valve. For example, opportunities to seek offsets outside a trading program can effectively reduce the expected cost to a particular emission goal—which is beneficial—but that does not

address concerns about unexpected events. In fact, if the system becomes dependent on these offsets, their inclusion can increase uncertainty about program costs if the availability and cost of the offsets themselves is not certain. Another proposal, a "circuit breaker," would halt future declines in the cap when the allowance price exceeds a specified threshold, but would do little to relax the current cap if shortages arise. Features that do provide additional allowances when shortages arise, such as the possibility of banking and borrowing extra allowances, are helpful, but only to the extent they can ameliorate sizeable, immediate, and persistent adverse events.

To summarize, the climate change problem is a marathon, not a sprint, and there is little environmental justification for heroic efforts to meet a short-term target. Such heroic efforts might not only waste resources, they risk souring our appetite to confront the more serious long-term problem. Absent a safety valve, a cap-and-trade program risks exactly that outcome in the face of surprisingly high demand for energy or the failure of inexpensive mitigation opportunities to arise as planned. A safety valve is the simplest, most transparent way to signal the market about the appropriate effort to meet short-term mitigation goals in the face of adverse events.

While trained economists hold divergent views on many topics—as our own views demonstrate—economic theory occasionally delivers a relatively crisp message that virtually everyone can agree on. We believe this is one of those occasions, and hope you will consider these points as Congress addresses various climate change policies in the coming months.

Sincerely,

R. GLENN HUBBARD,  
*Professor, Columbia  
University, Chair-  
man, Council of Eco-  
nomic Advisers,  
2001–2003.*

JOSEPH E. STIGLITZ,  
*Professor, Columbia  
University, Chair-  
man, Council of Eco-  
nomic Advisers 1995–  
1997.*

#### THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss a topic of worldwide importance, and that is the United Nations.

The United Nations was created in 1945 after World War II, and it was done to preserve world peace through collective security; and I believe, quite frankly, that it has failed miserably in its role.

As we approach the 60th anniversary of the United Nations, I wanted to discuss the United Nations this afternoon, to look at its original charter and its mission, and evaluate if the United Nations has accomplished what it was designed to do.

If we look over here, we have set out what its initial mission was: "The United Nations Failing its Mission." Its charter calls as follows: The U.N.

charter calls for maintaining international peace and security and to that end to take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace."

It sets forth in more detail, if we would read the charter, to maintain international peace and security, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats, to bring about the peace and world order.

Secondly, to develop friendly relations among nations based upon respect, respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

Thirdly, to achieve cooperation in solving international problems, problems of economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian in character.

And fourthly and finally, to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for the other fundamental freedoms that we all hold dear. Freedom from distinctions such as race, sex, language, and religion.

Unfortunately, if we look at the record of the United Nations over the last 60-some-odd years on any one of these issues, I think people would have to be in agreement with me that it has failed on each and every one. The United Nations has not maintained international peace and security. As we point out here, the number of wars that have occurred since 1945 number well over 300 wars. Those wars have translated into the deaths of some 22 million people.

The only times that the United Nations has ever supported intervening to try to actually stop hostilities, to try to prevent wars, to try to do and live up to what its mission says were on two occasions. One was with respect to the Korean War. And the only reason that that came about, if the Members recall their history, was that the Soviet Union at the U.N. in New York boycotted the Security Council meeting, and they were able to take a vote to intervene at that point.

And the second one was much more recent, and that, of course, was in the first Persian Gulf war. But other than those two examples, there has never been any example where the U.N. has successfully stepped in and prevented these wars; and because of it, 22 million lives have been lost.

Just over the last 10 years, there have been multiple genocides that occurred under the United Nations' watch. These have occurred in Bosnia; Rwanda; and now, as we speak, in the Darfur region of the Sudan. Each time the United Nations has failed to take the appropriate action and the action that was needed to put an end to those mass killings, and it was mainly due to political and economic pressures.

If we think about it, the biggest threat right now to the civilized world today, as we speak, is terrorism. And even in this field, the U.N. has failed throughout its existence to develop a clear definition of what terrorism really is.

Another main mission of the United Nations is to promote and encourage human rights and equal rights throughout the world. In this regard we have something called the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. This is the primary body that the U.N. has that is charged with accomplishing this objective. However, again, look at the record and see that the U.N. has failed in this area as well. Countries such as Cuba, the Sudan, China, countries that have a long history of violating human rights, countries such as these sit on the very commission in the U.N. that is supposed to be protecting the human rights and dignity of the people in these countries.

These countries' membership and others like them on this panel destroys the very credibility of this commission; and it prevents the United Nations from achieving its goals, those goals in promoting and strengthening human rights. In fact, it was just a short time ago, several years ago, that Libya, that country with that terrible human rights track record, was selected to serve as the very chairman of the Human Rights Commission.

When we get into the issue of dollars and cents, American taxpayers should be questioning just where their hard-earned tax dollars go. The United States pays almost 25 percent of the entire United Nations budget. The United States pays upwards of 25 percent of the entire budget for the U.N., estimated in the 25 percent ratio. But then when we compare that to the number of votes in the U.N. that side with the United States on important issues relative to the citizens of the state, the pie chart looks particularly different.

On the left, the pie chart showing almost a quarter of the budget coming from the U.S., U.S. taxpayers; on the right the pie chart showing the number of votes that are with us as opposed to being against us, and we just get a slight sliver. What is that number? The share of votes in the U.N. General Assembly siding with the United States is 1/2 percent. Less than 1 percent of the time does the U.N. side with the United States. The majority of the time, almost 99.5 percent of the time, they are against us. And despite the fact that we pay a vast majority, a huge percentage, of the U.N.'s budget, we have the same voting rights as anyone else there; we have the same voting power as countries such as Tunisia, Bulgaria, El Salvador; the same voting rights as some of the other countries that I mentioned previously, those countries with terrible human rights violation records that serve on the Commission of Human Rights, et cetera. Countries that are headed by dictators and tyrants have the same ability to influence that world body that we do in the U.N.

All these problems that I have mentioned lead back now to the very point that I am trying to make this afternoon, that the United Nations is in se-

rious need of major change and reform. Over the next hour my colleagues and I will discuss some of these problems, problems that the United Nations has had from its very foundation, from its very creation in 1945, and have existed right up to the present time. Some of these problems should be familiar to the Members as we see they make the headlines of some of the papers. Other papers we have to read in the back to actually find out what is going on with the U.N., problems including such things as the now infamous Oil-for-Food scandal, the sexual exploitation of women and little children in the Congo, also the ongoing crisis that I referenced earlier in the Darfur region of the Sudan.

We need to examine now the ways we need to take to reform the United Nations and make it a more accountable and transparent world body, if that is possible.

I should say that I commend the House Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) as well, the chairman of that committee, because he and the committee, as we speak and just recently, have been working to bring up legislation out of the committee now and before this House that will address these problems, bringing up and passing a substantial United Nations reform proposal. I look forward to that legislation coming to the floor of the House for our consideration, for our review, and hopefully for a vote on that legislation soon.

The lack of oversight and accountability by an international body that claims to represent the moral conscience of the world really should not be tolerated, should not be tolerated by the citizens of this country, should not be tolerated by the citizens of the world. As the largest financial contributor to the United Nations in the world, the United States is the one country in the best position now to demand those reforms.

So tonight let us take a look at some of those particular areas that I have referenced already in need of reform with regard to the legislation that we will be seeing soon out of committee and before this House for consideration.

Probably the one that is most familiar to the general public today is that dealing with the Oil-for-Food scandal; and when we think about it, it really is not that familiar to a lot of people because for a long time it was not getting mainstream press attention. In fact, if it was not for a newspaper in New York and a few other papers that focused on this extensively, we would never have seen this issue make the front pages of the paper elsewhere. And if it was not for certain news commentaries on stations like Fox and otherwise that did actually do a good job of bringing this issue to the fore, the rest of the mainstream media failed to dig into this issue to find out what the problems were with regard regards to the Oil-for-Food scandal.



So let us take this opportunity here this afternoon, then, to revisit that topic to allow the public to dig in and take a look at what the history was there and hopefully open the eyes of some people to some of the real problems within the U.N.

With regard to the Oil-for-Food scandal, we have to go back to the first gulf war. Back at that time, sanctions were put in place on Saddam Hussein and his entire regime, and those sanctions were put in place that forbade them from exporting their oil outside of their country. And we know that, of course, the oil revenue was his main revenue stream coming into that country. So restrictions were placed on that country saying that they could not export any more oil. And, of course, that was having a tremendous economic downward impact upon his country and, of course, the people that lived in it as well.

The U.N. became involved and said that there were problems for the regular common people in that country because of these sanctions. So in 1996 these restrictions were softened, and the U.N. established the Oil-for-Food program. And in that program, it allowed the Iraqi government, Saddam Hussein, to sell a limited amount of oil and a limited amount from his reserves, was able to sell outside of that country.

□ 1445

The revenue that would be coming back into Iraq was to be used for humanitarian purposes and supplies, food, housing and the like, medical supplies, for the regular people who were suffering in Iraq.

When the U.N. established this, however, Saddam Hussein demanded certain transaction payments from the companies and officials that were doing business with him. In other words, what happened here, these were basically kickbacks to Saddam Hussein, money that would turn around and then he would be able to use for other purposes, other than helping the people of his country.

The way it worked was simply this: Under the agreement set up with the U.N., he was able to designate those companies that would be the ones that would provide the humanitarian services. Well, if those companies wanted to have anything to do with getting that lucrative contract with his government, he would in turn compel them to make some sort of, I guess you would say, under-the-table kickback to himself personally and his government.

And what did he use that money for? He turned around and used that money for his army, for his generals, for munitions, and, of course, also to provide for the palaces that we have since seen that he enjoyed in that country, meanwhile while his people were destitute and in poverty. Also money that was used to provide funding to Palestinians and the homicide bomber families. Suicide bombing families who engaged in

that conduct were soon informed that their families would be receiving a stipend, if you will, of \$15,000 to \$25,000 or more, care of the Saddam Hussein government, care of the Oil-for-Food revenue stream.

Now, by allowing this corrupt system to continue and allowing Saddam Hussein to manipulate the Oil-for-Food Program and also to bribe government officials from other countries, and the reports have shown there has been an extensive list of government officials and people in high levels and positions in other countries, countries that perhaps it really should not surprise us, whether we are talking about people in Russia or in France, countries that were fighting the United States and our positions where we had taken a tougher stance on Saddam Hussein. I guess now, in retrospect, we know why some of those countries were fighting the United States and our position to try to help the people of Iraq, because there were people over in those countries that were receiving part of those kickbacks from Saddam Hussein.

In the end, how much money was diverted from the legitimate purposes of helping these people? How much money was diverted from providing for food and shelter and medical supplies? Well, altogether, the reports are now looking at \$21 billion was stolen by Saddam Hussein at the expense of his own people of his country.

Think about it. The U.N.'s Oil-for-Food Program was created to help provide humanitarian supplies, food and medicine, to the less fortunate. But Saddam Hussein, under the auspices and the willing hand, if you will, of the U.N., was allowed to use that money to advance weapons and military programs as the poor were continuing to be plagued by starvation and disease.

Now the most troublesome facts about the ongoing Oil-for-Food investigation now is the lack of cooperation being provided from the U.N. to get to the very bottom of how all this occurred and what actually took place. We will be taking a look at that in a little more detail to see how those reports came out and the fact that the U.N. continues to this day to fail to cooperate with Congress, with the information that we have sought to receive and also with regard to the information that we had received and actually now that the U.N. would like to get that information back.

I see I have been joined by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from the great State of Florida, who also I would presume would like to speak to the issue of the U.N. and the need for reform and some of the problems with the U.N.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his distinguished leadership in this and other matters.

Mr. Speaker, it is very sad that as I go back and talk to people in my dis-

trict about the role of the U.N., Americans know they are very disturbed by the U.N., but they like the idea of having this United Nations as a place where we can promote world peace and world security and do some other things. It is not until you explain the record of the United Nations, and before then the League of Nations, of total failure when it comes to promoting freedom, total failure when it comes to protecting collective security, total failure across the board that they really get frustrated.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey. The U.N. is in need of deep and drastic and dramatic reform, and it is very sad to see liberals in the United States Senate hold up a reformer like John Bolton's nomination merely because he believes that America's security and freedom should come first, and the United Nations needs a serious dose of reality.

I will tell you it has been sad historically to watch the fact that the United Nations, that was primarily the child after World War II of the British Government and the United States Government to promote security for the world and peace, has been a failure.

It was NATO that protected the freedom and the peace during the Cold War. The League of Nations, which was started in 1914-1915, failed to deter any major aggressor, including ultimately Hitler's Germany that attacked Western Europe and threatened peace throughout the world.

Just like the League of Nations failed to protect the security of free countries, so the U.N. has never once had any impact on protecting freedom-loving, peaceful countries from aggressive totalitarian countries, the Cold War being the biggest example but not the only example. The U.N. was of absolutely no value whatsoever throughout the Cold War with the Soviet Union, and it was NATO that preserved through power the peace. As Lady Thatcher said, it was Ronald Reagan who won the Cold War without firing a single shot.

Even in smaller regional conflicts, the U.N. historically has been a total waste of time, money, effort and resources. For example, Cuba having forces in Angola was never deterred by the U.N.; the Soviet Union invading Afghanistan, the Vietnamese and the Korean conflicts, again examples of the complete impotence of the United Nations to the detriment of freedom-loving peoples.

As my colleague pointed out, the Saddam Hussein failure has been a dramatic one, but it is just the most recent one, along with the Oil-for-Food scandal, the perverted use of some U.N. troops in undermining the safety of women and children, actually engaging in the rape and torture of these people.

Even when it comes to peacekeeping, something you would think the United Nations would be good at, they have a miserable record. In Somalia, it was U.N. troops that presided over the largest genocide in the last 10 years. They

actually facilitated the genocide by herding together folks that were ultimately slaughtered. In Rwanda, you had the Tutsis slaughtered by their oppressors. The United Nations was totally useless. In Yugoslavia, you had the horrible situation that resulted from the U.N. embargo, denying one side the arms to protect themselves while the other side engaged in mass slaughter in Bosnia and elsewhere.

I want to end, Mr. Speaker, by thanking the gentleman from New Jersey and saying there are some things that the United Nations can help at: distributing food in times of crisis. They are a nice debating society, but they have never once provided any bit of security to the United States or any of our friends. To the extent that they condemn anybody, it is typically our friends like Israel, when they equated Zionism, the belief that the Jewish people ought to have a state where they can be free from threats from oppression and anti-semitism and absolute genocide. It is Israel that has been condemned more than any other nation on Earth by the United Nations.

Finally, the United Nations has never been united in any way, shape or form. Some people say it is a democracy, but it is a democracy where a majority of the people that vote are actually dictators, tyrants. The majority of the United Nations is governed by places like the African Union, the Arab League and the Islamic Conference, often not only hostile to America's interests but some of these nations actually promoting terrorism itself.

So I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey. U.N. reform is a must. If we are not going to reform the U.N., it is time to pull out of the U.N., put together a group of freedom-loving, peaceful nations that will engage in real collective security, and not engage in this mirage where we pour our money down a rat trap, fund our enemies often, and embarrass ourselves by being a participant.

I yield back to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for those comments. The gentleman made a number of good points, the last one with regard to what they are good at. Before the gentleman got here, I put up the one chart as to what the charter of the U.N. says, what is their ultimate responsibility, why did we create the U.N. back after World War II. It was basically the larger mission.

There it is. The larger mission is maintaining international peace and security, which means to try to prevent future wars so we would not have another war of the world as we had in World War II, and to try to prevent future wars, where we have had over 300 wars.

Then the gentleman alluded to another point, which is interesting. The gentleman says if they are not doing what the charter tells them to do,

which is to try to make us all feel a little more secure at home, that we are not going to engage in another world war, maybe at least, the gentleman suggested, that they are helping out providing the delivery of food and the like, disaster relief.

But I think the gentleman will agree with me, because I know the gentleman follows the issue of the United States providing tsunami relief after the last devastation that occurred at the end of last year, how the White House was immediately taking action. Although it was not getting a lot of press and it was not actually looking for press at that time, the White House and this administration said we are going to just go in and get the job done, and we immediately sent our troops over there, our ships over in that region of the world.

We were not calling up the press on the same day we were doing it. The administration, they just said, we have a problem. Let us get the United States over there and try to solve the problem with regard to getting the food and supplies to the people.

I know the gentleman is very aware of that and was helpful in regard to moving the legislation to get funding there.

But as an individual who has gone on the ground in those countries that were suffering from the tsunami, one of the interesting aspects of it is not so much what the U.N. did, it is what the United States did and what some other bilateral agreements did. As the gentleman recalls, what happened was the United States stepped up and said we will provide troops and equipment immediately. We will also provide funding.

They intermediately entered into agreements with countries like India. India, of course, was right there. They had their ships within less than an hour on the scene. And we were actually getting the job done.

Later, the U.N. became involved. Even after the U.N. slowly began to make its presence known, it was not so much the U.N. that was doing the work, as the gentleman knows, it is the NGOs, all those other, what is the word for it, nonprofit entities, you might sort of say, that were on the ground, that were already in some of these countries, funded in large part by American taxpayer dollars. Those were the guys who were getting the job done.

So, just to conclude, I think the gentleman makes a good point that the U.N. does not do its original mission at all, which is to provide security to this country, but the other point is that all they really do is come in after the fact when it comes to providing food and medicine and still rely upon our tax dollar to get the job done.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman.

The United Nations, to the extent it does anything, it distributes food and

resources largely provided by the United States of America. There are other non-governmental organizations that do at least as good a job on most occasions. If it was not for the generosity of American taxpayers and American contributions, much of the world would never recover from some of the horrible disasters that occur.

But I do believe there is a potential role for the United Nations to play in continuing to be a world welfare organization in times of emergency relief perhaps and maybe a cocktail debating society. But unless there are dramatic reforms, they are good for nothing more. And it is a threat to our security if we even pretend that they ever have deterred an aggressor.

As the gentleman points out with his chart, since 1945, their main mission was to deter aggression by hostile countries to freedom. They have failed 300 times to do their main mission. So let us never depend on the United Nations for our security or to protect American interests.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. Before I go on, I will comment that the gentleman's comment about a debating society is one that I have used as well, but it is a debating society made of who? It is a debating society made up of tyrants, dictators and thugs, sort of like governments. I do not know that I really want to be engaged in a debating society like that. But I thank the gentleman for his work and support.

As was alluded to, one of the things the U.N. does not do is prevent wars. One of the things they might be able to do is help the people. That is what they were supposed to be doing with regard to the Oil-for-Food scandal situation, providing food to the people of Iraq through their oil revenue stream.

Unfortunately, as I was alluding to a moment ago, they failed miserably in that respect inasmuch as they allowed the dictator Saddam Hussein to use those dollars for other things, to use those dollars to help build up his military, to use those dollars to help build up their palaces for their generals, some of which I had the opportunity to see when I had gone over to Iraq to visit our troops over there, magnificent palaces that these generals and Saddam Hussein lived in at the time while the rest of the country was basically in squalor and poverty. That is where the Oil-for-Food revenue was going to.

It was also going to, as I said, people outside of his country, bribing basically government officials and other high-ranking individuals in other countries, such as Russia and France and elsewhere, the very same countries that were battling the United States in the U.N. saying that we should not be taking a tough position with Iraq, that we should allow them to continue on with the Oil-for-Food Program.

□ 1500

Well, now we know why. They wanted the Oil-For-Food program to continue

just so that they could continue to have a stream of money coming into their private bank rolls. Well, the U.N. finally found out that that was going on. Investigations were taking place, investigations are taking place here in this Congress. But, as I alluded to a moment ago, the very U.N. that we fund and house here in the United States in New York City, they failed to work with us here in Congress so that we can, as American citizens, get to the bottom of it and find out where our dollars are going to and exactly what sort of transparency we need in order to find out this information. The U.N. has shielded their very own people. The U.N. has said that we are not going to provide documents to Congress that the Congress wants, we are not going to provide people to come and testify before Congress that Congress needs.

So what did the U.N. do in this regard? Well, what the U.N. did do was set up their own commission, or the commission has been set up, as we are all familiar with now, to investigate, which is now known as the Volcker Commission, to investigate the allegations involving the Oil-For-Food.

The problem with that is a number of folds:

First of all, the gentleman who is heading up the Commission, Paul Volcker, an honorable gentleman, but someone it has been discovered has close ties himself to the U.N. in the past and to the Secretary General, Kofi Annan, in the past, as well as other conflicts of interest, so perhaps not the best to be heading up the investigation. Also, as far as the powers that that commission has, lack of subpoena powers, lack of ability to hold people in contempt in order to get them to testify before this commission.

And it is for those reasons that that commission has not done the study and has not done the inquiry that we would all like to have had, so we could get all the information out with regard to the Oil-For-Food scandal and the mismanagement at the top, at least the malfeasance, misfeasance at worst, at the top of the hierarchy of the U.N.

Paul Volcker also has been accused of downplaying Kofi Annan's involvement in the scandal. Several reports have come out of his commission with regard to this scandal, and others. They are called interim reports.

Several weeks ago, unfortunately for them, two of their top investigators who were working on his commission resigned from that investigatory body; they resigned. And the reason they did so, they said, was because they felt that the commission and the reports that have been issued by the commission basically are too soft, not hard-hitting enough, on Kofi Annan and Kofi Annan's involvement with the Oil-For-Food scandal. Those individuals and the information that they have been able to take out as far as documents and what have you would not have been available to Congress, had it not been that those people did not do the honor-

able thing and stand up and say that they are not going to be part of an investigation that is not much more than a whitewash of what is going on over at the U.N.

The second report, remember I said there were several interim reports, the second interim report's most troubling finding was the fact that Kofi Annan's chief of staff authorized the shredding of documents, numerous documents authorized by the chief of staff of Kofi Annan relating to the Oil-For-Food scandal. He retired on January 15, earlier this year. It was the same day that the committee was informed that these documents had been shredded. In other words, documents that would have been necessary to show the direct involvement of the parties to this action for Oil-For-Food were simply destroyed and shredded.

It is interesting to note that this is the same individual, the same chief of staff that previously had supposedly sent out an order saying that no documents should be discarded, that the commission should have access to all documents that they needed and sought; but at the end of the day, it was that individual himself, the chief of staff, that was found guilty. Well, not found guilty, but found as the individual who was shredding these documents.

Now that these other two individuals have resigned from the commission that have been referenced before because of their views on the report being too soft, they took with them certain documents and they took those documents, and those documents have found their way here to this House and to the investigatory bodies here in this House.

One would think that the U.N. and the Volcker Commission would say, that is fine. Now that you have the documents, go ahead and do all that you need. But what happened right after that? Well, we know from the reports in the press that Paul Volcker then came back and attempted as best he could to block congressional investigations from looking at these documents and, in fact, demanded those very same documents back. So, basically, just a pattern of blocking inquiry into what the U.N. has been doing and a pattern of standing in the way of citizens of the United States and the citizens of the world to see for themselves the poor job that the U.N. has done with regard to living up to its charter of protecting and making a secure world and protecting the people in Iraq.

I see that I am joined here this afternoon, and I appreciate that, by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE); and I yield to him.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong agreement with the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from New Jersey and our colleagues who have spoken in this Special Order, and I especially want to commend the

gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for being one of the singular and most effective voices about the truth about the United Nations in the 21st century on Capitol Hill, and I appreciate his leadership in organizing this Special Order today.

As a member of the newly organized Subcommittee on Oversight for the United Nations, I am especially grateful to have an opportunity to speak and to do so specifically, as the gentleman has requested, about legislation that we on the Committee on International Relations reported, literally just hours ago, when, by a very close vote, and what was I think an extraordinary and civil and thoughtful debate, the Committee on International Relations produced U.N. reform with teeth.

The Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005, we believe, will come to the floor of this Congress next week, and it will represent, in sum total, the most significant effort by the people of the United States of America to reform and amend this half-century-old institution. And that is the intention and the purpose of what, when it was introduced with the authorship of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and my singular cosponsorship, the Hyde/Pence bill purposes to do.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that if the United Nations did not exist as a forum for international deliberation, we would very likely have to invent it. The United Nations, not as a world government, but as a world deliberative forum, serves an important role. But because of years of mismanagement, mindless bureaucracy, and, as the gentleman has spoken with force and authority today, profound corruption, this institution's vitality and survival in the 21st century is at risk without fundamental reform. And that is precisely what the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act brings.

But I say very carefully and directly, this is not a bill that provides an outline for reform of the United Nations with, if I can speak plainly, the United States providing virtually a third of the funding for this institution and then saying, we think these are good ideas for reform; we sure hope you do too. This is U.N. reform with teeth.

In fact, we use a variety of methods of leverage in the United Nations Reform Act of 2005, but that which has caught the most notice is the potential withholding of 50 percent of U.S. assessed dues if certifications are not made in the critical areas of reform that are described. Those areas include budgeting. The Hyde legislation urges the shifting of 18 programs from regular assessed budget authority to voluntary funded programs that will be a great deal more accountable in the process.

On the subject of accountability, the Hyde legislation mandates the creation of an independent oversight board with broad investigative authority through the Office of Internal Oversight Services, what will come to be known as

the OIOS, will have the authority to initiate investigations into mismanagement and wrongdoing and establish procedures to protect U.N. employees or contractors who serve in a whistleblowing capacity.

In the area of human rights, the U.N. Reform Act also has a get-tough policy mandating that the United Nations adopt criteria for membership on any human rights policy within the institution. Under these criteria, countries that fail to uphold the universal declaration of human rights would be ineligible for membership. Now, this may come as a shock to any that are looking in today, Mr. Speaker, but that is not required today. There are countries who participate in human rights forums in the United Nations that do not uphold the universal declaration of human rights. We say that should not be the case.

And in the area of peacekeeping, where there have been such extraordinary scandals of late, children, little girls, 10, 11 and 12 years of age being sexually molested by blue-helmeted U.N. peacekeepers, which photographs record being made of the molestation and then the trafficking of those records, there are fundamental reforms in the Hyde legislation that would mandate a single and enforceable uniform code of conduct for all personnel serving in peacekeeping missions.

And there is a strict mandate that the criteria of the commission on peacekeeping reform that was adopted by the United Nations, that the five criteria and objectives be implemented in the immediate before any additional peacekeeping operations can be authorized by the President of the United States.

I want to yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey because there will be ample time on the floor next week, I believe, when the U.N. Reform Act comes to this floor, to unpack it for the American people. But it is, in a very real sense, an opportunity to take that information that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is leading on to the floor today and who has been such a champion of, taking the truth about the U.N. and saying, here is the proper response of the American people.

As I close, let me say that one response could simply be the American people, through their elected representatives, could profoundly reduce our participation financially in the United Nations. And it is important to say that the U.N. Reform Act keeps funding level. There is no reduction in funding by the people of the United States of America to the United Nations in the U.N. Reform Act. There is a potential for as much as a 50 percent reduction in assessed dues if the United Nations, through its membership and internal organs, does not fundamentally adopt and implement reform in the next 2 to 3 years.

It is U.N. reform with teeth, and for all of the reasons that the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) effectively brings to the floor today, the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act of 2005 is an idea whose time has come.

I yield back with gratitude to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, as well, for joining us here this afternoon and also for the work that he has already done on the committee. I commend him for that. I know the gentleman is well respected by all of our colleagues for his insightfulness and level-headedness as far as addressing this issue because, as he pointed out, we could be going in either extreme on this issue.

Probably, when we get into the debate on this legislation next week, whether it becomes partisan or not, I can imagine that there will be extremes from both sides, so I appreciate the gentleman's moderation on this and his hard work on this. I am sure the gentleman joins with me in supporting the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE).

In essence, what the committee is doing is they are looking for in the Reform Act of 2005, these are my words, not the committee's words, but they are looking for oversight, accountability, and cutting bureaucracy. I guess the same thing that they were always looking for in any form of entity, government or otherwise, that plays an important role in our lives. We do not want a huge bureaucracy, we do want a level of accountability so we know who is responsible and we can hold them accountable for what they have done, and we want oversight. We want somebody, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) alluded to, somebody, some apparatus who would be in a position to be able to step back for a moment and take a look at the situation as a whole and see whether they are complying with their overall charter and complying with their overall mission.

□ 1515

As we have alluded to already this evening, we already know throughout history they have not been doing so, so now we have to decide what to do with it.

I referenced before the problems, the ongoing investigation with the U.N. and what they have found so far. The behavior of the U.N. up to date, in my opinion, is just totally indefensible with regard to their investigations and the investigations that they are taking, blocking for Congress to take. I, for one, take the position, and have signed on to legislation that we had last year when these issues first came up, to say that we should be suspending all, we should be suspending all funding to the U.N. until they agree to fully cooperate and provide us with that level of accountability.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) has legislation that addresses the issue and says that we should be withholding some level of funding to

the U.N. until there is a true accounting, until we can certify that we actually know where all of that money went to.

Remember how much we were talking about here? \$21 billion has been effectively stolen, stolen from the people of Iraq, the poor, destitute people of Iraq, during the entire scandal by Saddam Hussein and other people around the world and his regime, the largest theft, I guess, in world history. And we are just looking for an accountability for that.

It is really an outrage when you think about it. The American public should be outraged about what has occurred at the U.N. The world community should be outraged about what occurred at the U.N., and right over in Iraq in the work of Saddam Hussein and right under the noses of the administrators at the U.N.?

A \$21 billion scandal, and it is only now beginning to have the facts come out. We have a responsibility as Members of the Congress to continue with this investigation. We have a responsibility, as alluded to before by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), to make sure that if we are going to be providing them any of your hard-earned tax dollars that we will get to the bottom of it, hold those people responsible for what their actions were, for participating in or profiting from this outrage. They need to lose their jobs or go to jail or both.

So that is just one tip of the iceberg problem with the U.N. And I can allude just to a point how this impacts upon the world issue, world community as far as security and terrorism is concerned. I think I have the chart here.

I referenced before what Saddam Hussein was able to do with the money, buy houses and palaces and military. But part of it, also, in not too complex an arrangement here, part of it also helped to facilitate suicide bombers which we see on TV more frequently than any of us want. But suicide bombers in other parts of the world as well?

I mentioned before that there was a situation where he was getting kickbacks from payments from companies in the Oil-for-Food program. Some of that money then went to a bank account in Jordan. There was also revenue coming into the regime, a \$3 a barrel fee for oil. That was paid by the Jordanian Government as part of their agreement over with Iraq to get some of money out. Again, that money ended up in a Jordanian bank account there. There is a bank, Rafidian Bank in Iraq. That money was there; and other sources as well, I should say. The top line here shows sources of money: kickbacks, fee per barrel and other sources of funds as well.

All of that money coming into the regime, and where did it go? Into the various bank accounts that regime controlled. And eventually out of that bank account and to the families of suicide bombers. \$15, \$20, \$25, upwards of \$35,000 each was going to the families of suicide bombers to help them

out and to encourage that heinous type of action that we see as life is being taken from other families and individuals.

The regime was supporting it. The U.N. was basically facilitating it by allowing it to occur under their noses.

I am seeing now that I am joined by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for bringing forth this important special order and for his presentation with regard to the United Nations.

I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about how we might better reform the United Nations and how we might better direct the future of this country and the world. There has been a lot said, Mr. Speaker, about the United Nations and what kind of a structure it is. This country has for a long time believed very firmly in the sense that we can bring together an international dialogue, resolve the world's problems and avoid war. That was why the League of Nations was established and certainly why the United Nations was established. The U.N. was established in an endeavor to correct some of the mistakes that were made with the League of Nations and establish an organization that might function essentially in perpetuity in a fashion that is going to be helpful towards peace and security in the world.

Unfortunately, it has not worked out so much that way, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the entire structure of the United Nations is something we do not talk about very often. It has a huge flaw, and the flaw is this, that in the minds of the people in this country and around the world we believe, since we have a forum there, we have a general assembly there that brings in voices from nearly every nation in the world and they sit in a place and they have an open forum and an open debate, that somehow that is a semblance of democracy and so, therefore, the will of the people of the world will be manifested in the policy of the United Nations.

The big flaw is that many of those people that sit there are either dictators themselves or mouthpieces for dictators, people that would cut the tongues out of their own constituents if they were to stand up and speak like a free people as we do here in this country. So, therefore, the voice of the world is not heard in the United Nations. It is often the voice of the rulers, the despots.

In fact, as we listened to the United Nations and the loudest voices in the United Nations prior to our engagement and liberation of Iraq, we heard a loud noise come from France, and they were organizing intensively to oppose the United States' potential operations in Iraq? That same noise came from Germany, and it came from Russia, and it came from China, where we remember those days two-and-a-half, 3 years ago.

I said at the time that the decibels of resistance to a potential liberation of

Iraq that came from those countries and others in addition to that can be indexed almost directly in proportion to their oil interests in Iraq and in the Middle East. In fact, at the time I did not know how prophetic that was, because we were not aware at the time of the Oil-for-Food Program. Now when you add that at least \$10.1 billion worth of fraud that came with Oil-for-Food, the \$5.7 billion in oil smuggling, the \$4.4 billion in illicit surcharges, we know now it is bigger than that.

We know the names of some of the players? We know that those players were in places where their voices were echoed in opposition to the liberation of the Iraqi people. One can only suspect their interest was to continue raking the gravy off of the Oil-for-Food Program and pocket the money themselves. So they had what is called a vested interest. In fact, if I remember the words of Barber Conable, it was, Hell hath no fury like a vested interest masquerading as a moral principle. Well, their moral principle was actually an immoral principle, a principle of profit. That is part of the corruption of the United Nations.

There is a sex scandal within the administration that brought actually sometimes more media than the Oil-for-Food scandal did. And then we have those things.

We need to keep encouraging the investigation into the Oil-for-Food Program, and then we have the operations of peacekeeping in Africa where we have peacekeepers perpetuating sexual violence on innocent citizens, innocent people.

An organization like this that does not have a legitimate oversight program truly needs a U.N. Reform Act? I am 100 percent supportive of this U.N. Reform Act. A number of the components in here are essential. I think it is essential that the United States looks at holding back and reserving some of its dues to the United Nations until we get a bright light that shines on the United Nations, until we have a United Nations that functions as truly the voice of the people of the world and has the accountability like we have here in the United States.

So, with that, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I thank him for his work.

I know that the American public agrees with you when you say that we should be withholding funding to an organization such as this where there is no accountability and there is no transparency of what has been going on all of these many years and this failing mission. So I thank you for your work.

At this time, I see we are joined by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for yielding and his leadership in underscoring the lengthy, loathsome and lewd history that the United Nations possesses, a history of the deception and dishonesty and duplicity.

As a former judge in Houston, Texas, for over 20 years, I believe in consequences for bad conduct. When improper behavior takes place, I do not believe that we should say to the perpetrator, the person responsible, try to do a little better. Normally, we look to the head of the organization when the organization is floundering, especially in corruption.

In order for the U.N. to regain credibility, Kofi Annan must step down. Under his watch, the world's largest financial and human rights scandal has occurred. The U.N. Oil-for-Food scandal makes the Enron scandal in Houston, Texas, look like theft of a toothbrush. This U.N. scandal resulted in millions of lives languishing in Iraq. In the ongoing investigation, it appears as though Kofi Annan and his top staff may have obstructed justice, may have destroyed piles of files that many suspect reveal how he knew what was going on all along.

There should be consequences, and my question is, what is the United Nation's position on the consequences in its own body for improper corrupt conduct? Why cannot the United Nations enforce basic civil rules for conduct?

Let us revisit just briefly some of the accusations against the United Nations in addition to the Oil-for-Food disgrace. How about the 150 allegations of sexual abuse by U.N. civilian staff and soldiers in the Congo? Accusations which include prostitution, rape, pedophilia. Or what about the numerous cases of abuse among peacekeepers in the northeastern town of Bunia? This does not include previous reports of peacekeeping abuses in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Bosnia, and Somalia, and the list goes on and on.

How about the tragic tales of defenseless North Korean defectors who faced deprivation or worse at the hands of U.N.-operated refugee camps? Or the investigations into the involvement of U.N. affiliates in trafficking prostitution in Kosovo? Not to mention, Mr. Speaker, some of the internal misconduct we have heard about like the allegations of sexual harassment, abuse of power, unwanted physical conduct within at least one U.N. administrative office. And let us not forget the indications that Kofi Annan's son, Kojo, may have engaged in corruption by way of the Swiss company for which he worked that inspected items going to Iraq on behalf of the Oil-for-Food program.

Whether or not we ever substantiate claims that the UN's Oil-for-Food initiative has ties to international terrorism, one thing is certain: Outlaws within the ranks of the United Nations have instigated terror in the lives of people across the globe. Rather than weeping for joy at the arrival of United Nation relief, many of those people run in panic at thought of such a sordid savior touching the ground in their own country.

Whatever happened to the United Nations' charter promise that advances

justice and respect for obligations arising from treaties and the dignity and the worth of the human person?

In fact, in raising the United Nations' duty to promoting dignity and humanity, how ironic it has become that countries like Sudan, Zimbabwe, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, and even China now comprise the membership in the United Nations' Commission on Human Rights.

This body must act. It must act now. And it must start with demanding that Kofi Annan step down. He is responsible for the conduct of the United Nation, because in our society we look to the head of any organization. Then let us try to aid congressional investigators in their efforts to unravel the deception and gluttony and the corruption perpetrated for years by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to make those comments; and I hope that we as a body can make a statement that the United Nations is going to be held accountable for its conduct.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his comments. I thank you for bringing so many of points to the public's attention.

You raise a point of whatever happened to the U.N. charter. That is something we have been discussing tonight extensively. Whatever did happen to the charter and the role that the U.N. was set up for back in 1945?

You also used the expression, I noticed a couple of times as you went through, a litany, a litany of abuses by the U.N., whether it was the 150 human rights abuses or the forced prostitution and on and on. Each time I noticed that you mentioned the words, you said "not to mention this," as a phrase. Well, it is good thing. I appreciate the fact that you are here tonight. I appreciate the fact that you are mentioning these points, because, as you know, most of these points are not being mentioned in the mainstream media. Most of these points are not being driven home back at home, throughout our communities and the rest of the world as well.

So I applaud you for mentioning them and making sure that these are at the front of people's attention so that this body can do just as you said, hold this institution accountable. I thank the gentleman for his work.

□ 1530

The gentleman has raised so many important points that we need to go to in more detail. And as we begin to look at the reform next week, legislation, I hope that we will have the opportunity to explore each and every one of these in more detail so that the public can have a better understanding of just the number of abuses. We just touched on a little bit of detail about the Oil-for-Food scandal and abuses of the U.N. as far as that scandal and as far as the cover up that seems to be going on.

I join with the gentleman in saying that we should be asking for the head of the U.N. to step down now so that he can be replaced with someone that we all have confidence in in the interim period of time until, if ever, reform is made at the U.N. so that American taxpayers can look and say with pride, this is where our tax dollars are going, as opposed to the abuses where it is going on right now; the abuses that are, as I said before, just a litany. The gentleman mentioned the 150 alleged human rights abuses by the U.N., by the very peacekeepers who are going into these countries that are trying to make these countries safe, such as in the Congo. Instead, they bring tragedy to the very people who become victims of the U.N. as opposed to the warring factions that are over there.

The gentleman made reference also to the idea of forced prostitution. This is forced prostitution by little tiny kids. 10-year-old girls have been allegedly used and compelled into prostitution, a tragedy that is happening under the auspices of the U.N. body that we are funding. These young women, these young girls that are being compelled to be involved in this, the phrase used now just as we had the Oil-for-Food scandal, now we have the sex-for-food scandal as well.

We are talking about impoverished countries over there where food is hard to come by and people are starving in parts of Africa. And they are being, well, forced under these conditions to sell themselves for a jug of milk or a bit of food or for a dollar. For that reason now the phrase sex-for-food is here. They have also been phrased "the dollar girls" in these areas as well, again, under the watchful noses and willing acquiescence by the U.N. because it is the very people that the U.N. has engaged over there that have allowed this conduct to go on.

I believe we have significantly more issues to address, but we have only touched the tip of the iceberg as far as the need of reform or the drastic changes as far as the relationship between the United States and the U.N. I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to bring it to the American public.

#### CATCH THE BUS OF OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last month I was able to do a Special Order thanks to the minority leader and her staff who have secured time so that I can come on to the House floor and address this Congress and the leadership of this Congress and the American people.

Last month's Special Order, which is what these talks are called after legislative business has been dispensed with, was about a bus, the bus of oppor-

tunity. And it was a plea to the leaders of this Congress, to the leaders of this administration, to the leaders of this country to not allow Americans to be left behind as the bus of opportunity pulls off.

I talked about the experience that I had with a little boy who was trying to catch a metro bus to school. And he yelled to me and I ran and I ran and I ran to catch up with that bus and I told the little boy, You can run. You can catch the bus. And we caught that bus as it idled at a red light. We pounded on the door. The bus driver nodded her recognition of my request to let the little boy board the bus, and then she shook her head no and drove away. The little boy was crushed, but he caught the next bus, and I assume he successfully made it to school.

Then I talked about some statistics from leading organizations that keep them about the dire straits faced by too many Americans, and in particular too many African Americans. I showed these charts on imprisonment, the disparities that exist in our country. If you look at imprisonment, which is an indication of the status of justice in this country, it will take for the gap to close between the rates of imprisonment for African Americans and the rates of imprisonment for white Americans to close, it will take 190 years.

For poverty, for the rate of poverty experienced by African Americans, to catch up to the rate of poverty experienced by white Americans it will take 150 years to close that gap if nothing is done in the area of public policy. Child poverty, 210 years to erase the gap of a large number of African American children who experience poverty. Income, 581 years to close the income gap experienced by African Americans in this country. And, finally, because the President talks about homeownership and the power of homeownership and how this budget that this Congress is now in the process of passing, is to promote homeownership in this country, sadly the rate of homeownership in the African American community pales in comparison to that experienced in the white community. It will take 1,664 years to close the homeownership gap if nothing is done.

So I ask the leadership of this Congress to please pay attention to these statistics because these statistics represent real people. And despite what the Republicans say about us having a growth economy, the sad fact is that if we do nothing, too many Americans are being left behind, too many Americans. And so I ask that we leave no American behind.

Mr. Speaker, in Iraq I ask the question tonight, are we leaving our soul behind? Who are we as a country? What have we become? Do the American people even care? What can we do to regain our soul?

Mr. Speaker, I have noted on this floor that the snows of Kilimanjaro are melting, that the glaciers in the Arctic are melting, that we have real serious



problems that the best minds in our country can devote their talent to solving. And I would like to read a quote from Dwight David Eisenhower about how we choose to spend our resources. He said, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." President Eisenhower said that.

Then John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address reminded us that the world is very different now for man, for man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. Kennedy said, "Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request. That both sides begin anew the quest for peace before the dark powers of destruction released by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction." Planned or accidental self-destruction.

Today I would like to do a rollcall, a rollcall of the young men and women who have died in Iraq from my home State of Georgia as compiled by my local newspaper on Monday, May 30. In addition, I would like to read a few articles and I would like to read those articles all with one question or one series of questions in mind: Who are we? What do we stand for? What is being done in our name? Is there a way out?

I will begin to read Georgia's Memorial Day honor roll. Jamaal Addison, 22, died March 23, 2003; Diego Fernando Rincon, 19, died March 29, 2003; Wilbert Davis, age 40, died April 3, 2003; Edward J. Korn, 31, died April 3, 2003; David T. Nutt, 32, died May 14, 2003; John K. Klinesmith, Jr., died June 12, 2003; Michael Crockett, age 27, died July 24, 2003; Nathaniel Hart, Jr., age 29, died July 28, 2003; Bobby Franklin, age 38, died August 20, 2003; Benjamin Freeman, age 19, died October 13, 2003; Jerry Wilson, age 45, died November 23, 2003; Marshall Edgerton, age 27, died December 11, 2003; Christopher Holland, age 26, died December 17, 2003; Nathaniel Johnson, age 22, died January 8, 2004; Ricky Crockett, age 38, died January 12, 2004; Thomas Thigpen, age 52, died March 16, 2004; William R. Strange, age 19, died April 2, 2004; Justin Johnson, age 22, died April 10, 2004; Antoine Holt, age 20, died April 10, 2004; Marvin Camposiles, age 25, died April 17, 2004; Marquis Whitaker, age 20, died April 27, 2004; Christopher Dickerson, age 33, died April 30, 2004.

□ 1545

Juan Lopez, age 22, died June 21, 2004. Tyler Brown, age 26, died September 14, 2004. Foster Pinkston, age 47, died September 16, 2004. Michael Scarborough, age 28, died October 30, 2004. Kelley Courtney, age 28, died October 30, 2004. Dan Malcom, Junior, age 25, died November 10, 2004. Jonathan Shields, 25, died November 12, 2004. Jeffrey Blanton, age 23, died December 12, 2004.

Bennie J. Washington, age 25, died January 4, 2005. Jesus Fonseca, age 19, died January 17, 2005. David Salie, age 34, died February 14, 2005. Tyler Dickens, age 20, died April 12, 2005. John McGee, age 36, died May 2, 2005. Charles Gillican, the Third, age 35, died May 14, 2005.

The sad fact, even sadder than the way I feel right now after having read those names, is that we may not even have the real story. We may not even have the true costs of this war. I am told U.S. military personnel who died in German hospitals en route to German hospitals are not counted. So, in addition to the more than 1,000 Americans who have lost their lives in this war, there are an additional 6,210 who died in German hospitals or en route to those hospitals.

Brian Harring writes in the Domestic Intelligence Reporter that the Bush administration has sworn up and down that it will never reinstate the draft. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, in an op-ed blaming conspiracy mongers for attempting to scare and mislead young Americans, insisted that the idea of reinstating the draft has never been debated, endorsed, discussed, theorized, pondered or even whispered by anyone in the Bush administration.

However, in the Domestic Intelligence Reporter, Brian Harring writes that assertion is demonstrably false. According to an internal Selective Service memo made public under the Freedom of Information Act, the agency's acting director met with two of Rumsfeld's under secretaries in February, 2003, precisely to debate, discuss and ponder a return to the draft.

The memo then proposes in detail that the Selective Service be reengineered to cover all Americans, men and, for the first time, women, ages 18 to 34.

I ask the question, what are we setting ourselves up for? What exactly are we doing?

The Washington Post ran an article, and it told us that the Army was going to issue combat badges for soldiers not in the infantry. The opening paragraph states: Any Army soldier who has seen active combat while in Iraq or Afghanistan may now receive a new Combat Action Badge, making tens of thousands of soldiers who are not in the infantry ranks, including women, eligible for a combat award for the first time. It recognizes that in the current realities of the battlefield and insurgency any soldier can be subject to a combat situation.

However, the story also recognizes that more than halfway through fiscal year 2005 the Army is 15 percent behind in its effort to enlist new soldiers.

What is this administration's position on women in combat?

The Mideast Stars and Stripes ran a story entitled, Marine Raid Breaks Gender Barrier.

"Lance Corporal Erin Libby doesn't want to be treated the same as her male Marine Corps counterparts. But

she does want to be treated as an equal, even in combat.

"In a way, she got her chance last weekend when Marines from the 3rd Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment, led a raid into the city of Karmah in search of high-value targets and hidden weapons.

"We're out here, and we're rocking on the front line," said Libby, a 21-year old from Niceville, Florida.

"This is history," Chief Warrant Officer Jill St. John is quoted as saying. "I've been in the Marine Corps for 18 years, and this is my first opportunity to be out with an infantry company. Even 5 years ago, the Marine Corps wouldn't be doing this. This is a major change in how we think women can be used in the military."

Then there is the headline from the Guardian that says, The U.S. Lowers Standards in Army Numbers Crisis. Why do we need to do this?

"The U.S. military has stopped battalion commanders from dismissing new recruits for drug abuse, alcohol, poor fitness and pregnancy in an attempt to halt the rising attrition rate in an Army under growing strain."

Last month, the Army announced that it was 6,000 soldiers short of its recruitment targets for the year so far, and tomorrow we are supposed to hear the latest numbers for recruitment.

We are told in this article that recruiters have been given greater leeway. By doing things to increase quantity, you are also doing things to decrease quality, but they have made the judgment that that is the way to go.

Now the Stars and Stripes ran a story that has to be disheartening to anyone who would read it. The headline: Advocates See Veterans of War on Terror Joining the Ranks of the Homeless.

"Advocates for the homeless already are seeing veterans from the war on terror living on the street and say the government must do more to ease their transition from military to civilian life.

"Veteran affairs officials estimate that about 250,000 veterans are homeless on any given night, and another 250,000 experience homelessness at some point."

How can it be that if we have a million people sleeping on the streets of America at night that a quarter of them could be veterans? How do we choose to spend our money? It is certainly not to decrease the disparities that exist in this country, and it certainly is not to get rid of those who are homeless, and it certainly is not to take care of even the veterans, the veterans of our current war on terror. Too many of them are sleeping on the street.

As for the war in Iraq, how did we get into this? My colleagues can come down and talk about the war. War is just a word for many of us who do not experience it, who do not feel it, who do not understand it. But there is an author by the name of James Bamford

who has done a lot of writing about the U.S. intelligence establishment. He has written a new book, and he was interviewed by a Kevin Zeese about the new book. That book is entitled, *A Pretext For War*, and this is how Bamford explains how it came to be that we got involved in this war. This is what Bamford says.

James Bamford says of his book, "Pretext is the only book to take an in-depth look at the U.S. intelligence community from before 9/11 to the war in Iraq. It describes how CIA Director George Tenet, while succeeding in increasing the personnel strength of the CIA's clandestine service during the late 1990s, failed to change the culture, direction and training from a Cold War focus to a counterterrorism focus . . . Thus, the CIA never even tried to penetrate al Qaeda during the years leading up to 9/11, believing it too difficult, too dangerous or not their job, depending on which agency official I interviewed." This is James Bamford speaking.

He continues to say, "Pretext also takes the only minute-by-minute look, about one-third of the book, at the confusion and chaos taking place among senior officials in Washington and elsewhere in the hours following the 9/11 attack. It examines everything from the secret locations to which the Vice President and other officials disappeared, to the evacuation of the intelligence agencies, to the highly secret continuance of government procedures that were activated, many for the very first time.

"Next, Pretext describes how the claims involving Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, the connections between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda and Hussein's involvement with 9/11 were simply used as pretexts for a war long planned by a small group of neoconservatives supportive of the Israeli government's policies and the expansion of U.S. military power throughout the Middle East. It examines how top Bush administration officials, Richard Perle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser first drafted a plan outlining an attack on Iraq and removal of Saddam Hussein in 1996.

□ 1600

"But the document titled 'A Clean Break' was drafted for Israel not the United States." This is James Bamford speaking: "At the time the three were acting as advisers to newly elected Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. 'Israel can shape its strategic environment. This effort can focus on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, an important Israeli strategic objective.' Not satisfied with regime change in Iraq, they went on to recommend that Israel shape its strategic environment by rolling back Syria."

Bamford continues: "Wurmser then authored a paper in January 2001 arguing that the U.S. and Israel jointly launch a preemptive war throughout the Middle East and North Africa to es-

tablish U.S.-Israeli dominance. The U.S. and Israel should 'strike fatally, not merely disarm, the centers of radicalism in the regions of Damascus, Baghdad, Tripoli, Tehran and Gaza.' He added that 'crisis were opportunities.'" This is Wurmser being quoted by James Bamford. Bamford continues: "About the same time on January 30, 2001, President Bush held his first National Security Council meeting, and according to former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill discussed only two topics, becoming closer to Israel's Ariel Sharon and locating targets to attack in Iraq."

Bamford continues: "As Wurmser had suggested following the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration immediately began using the crisis as an opportunity to launch their long-planned war against Iraq.

"At 2:40 p.m. on September 11, as the Pentagon was still burning," and this is Bamford continuing, "Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld dictated notes of his intention to blame Saddam Hussein even though there was no evidence of such link and all of the intelligence pointed exclusively to bin Laden and al Qaeda. 'Hit S.H. at same time.'" That is Rumsfeld. "'Sweep him up whether related to 9/11 or not.'" Bamford continues: "Next Wurmser was put in charge of a secret unit in Feith's office with a cover name Policy Counterterrorism Evaluation Group. Its function was to gather and feed less than credible intelligence, intelligence discredited by the CIA such as the supposed Niger uranium deal to the White House and Vice President CHENEY's office. Wurmser is now Cheney's top Middle East adviser."

Bamford continues: "Finally, Pretext closely examines the numerous lies and deceptions presented to the Congress, the American people, and the world in order to justify the war in Iraq."

Bamford says: "Finally, Pretext closely examines the numerous lies and deceptions presented to the Congress, the American public, and the world in order to justify the war in Iraq."

One last note: he also tells us that there is another problem and that is of the CIA's new license to kill anytime and anywhere, overseas without oversight. He says they are now using missile-armed drones to do assassinations in Pakistan, Yemen, Afghanistan, and other places in total secrecy, often without notice even to the host countries; and these problems just scratch the surface in the intelligence community. James Bamford, author, investigative journalist, reporter, telling us the truth about how we came to be in Iraq.

I would invoke another name, the name is Pat Tillman. Pat Tillman's family questions the reversal on the cause of the Ranger's death. The Washington Post tells us that former NFL player Pat Tillman's family is lashing out against the Army saying that the military's investigations into Tillman's friendly-fire death in Afghani-

stan last year were a sham, and the Army's efforts to cover up the truth have made it harder for them to deal with their loss more than a year after their son was shot several times by his fellow Army Rangers.

Tillman's mother and father said in interviews they believe the government and the military created a heroic tale about how their son died to foster a patriotic response across the country. They say the Army's lies about what happened have made them suspicious and they are certain they will never get the full story. "Pat had high ideals about the country, that is why he did what he did," Mary Tillman said in her first lengthy interview since her son's death. "The military let him down. The administration let him down. It was a sign of disrespect. The fact that he was the ultimate team player and he watched his own men kill him is absolutely heartbreaking and tragic. The fact that they too lied about it afterwards is disgusting."

Pat Tillman's father says, "Maybe lying is not a big deal any more. Pat is dead, and this is not going to bring him back. But these guys should have been held up to scrutiny right up the chain of command, and no one has.

"If this is what happens when someone high profile dies, I can only imagine what happens with everyone else." These are quotes from the Washington Post from Pat Tillman's parents.

And then there is the matter of the money, the money, the cost of this war. The cost of these priorities is at the expense of America's neighborhoods. Where is the money?

The Washington Post again tells us that an audit of Iraq's spending spurs criminal probe. Now the Department of Defense has admitted that they cannot track \$2.3 trillion, and we know that \$100 million has been lost here and \$9 million has been lost there, an estimate of \$1 billion being lost every month. This Washington Post article says investigators have opened a criminal inquiry into millions of dollars missing in Iraq after auditors uncovered indications of fraud and nearly \$100 million in reconstruction spending that could not be properly accounted for.

But the leadership in this administration has told us that we can expect war for the next generation. And, indeed, it appears that preparations are being made for such a war, for such an endeavor. Military expansionism, directly against what Dwight Eisenhower warned us about.

We have been told that Bush and Karzai signed a pact for long-term U.S. military presence in Afghanistan. They called it a strategic partnership. The Guardian tells us that the U.S. military is going to build four giant new bases in Iraq.

These U.S. bases pave the way for long-term intervention in Central Asia. The U.S. Government, we are told, has acquired basing or transit rights for passage of war planes and military supplies from nearly two dozen countries

in Central Asia, the Middle East and their periphery, a projection of American power into the center of the Eurasian land mass that has no historical precedent. All told, there are about 350,000 troops deployed worldwide. According to 2002 Pentagon documents, there were only 46 countries in the entire world that had no U.S. military presence. Only 46 countries in the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention tonight as I begin to wind down, H.R. 2723, which was introduced recently by my esteemed colleague from New York to provide for the common defense by requiring that all young persons in the United States, including women, perform a period of military service or a period of civilian service in furtherance of the national defense and homeland security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2723 establishes civilian service, military service, a requirement. It sets out the length of time of that service, conditions for termination of that service, types of civilian service, implementation standards by the President, compensation and benefits for people age 18 to 26. It establishes deferments and postponements for high school students, those experiencing certain hardships and disability, establishes induction exceptions, for example, for people who do not have proper training. It establishes conscientious objection and alternative noncombatant or civilian service, discharge, and includes women.

So I thought I would go to the Selective Service Web site and it tells us that Selective Service is also capable of providing inductees with special skills such as health care personnel after authorizing legislation is passed by Congress and a draft is ordered by the President.

□ 1615

The agency would also administer an alternative service program for men classified as conscientious objectors who are required to perform such service in lieu of serving in the military. The question I asked is, how did we get here and where are we going?

I would just like to conclude with the words, and I do not think I will have enough time to read the entire document, but all of this information that I have recounted today is available on the Internet. It is in the public domain. It is available in newspapers, domestic and international. It is just a matter of being able to put it all together and reading, reading and understanding.

Smedley Darlington Butler, who was a major general in the United States Marine Corps, wrote a little tome entitled, *War is a Racket*. I would like to submit the entire document into the RECORD and I will read as much of it as I think I can. At least I will read the first opening paragraphs.

"War is a racket. It always has been.

"It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international

in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives.

"A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people. Only a small 'inside' group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit of the very few, at the expense of the very many. Out of war a few people make huge fortunes.

"In the World War," and he is talking about World War I because this was written a long time ago, "a mere handful garnered the profits of the conflict. At least 21,000 new millionaires and billionaires were made in the United States during the First World War. That many admitted their huge blood gains in their income tax returns. How many other war millionaires falsified their tax returns no one knows. How many of these war millionaires shouldered a rifle? How many of them dug a trench? How many of them knew what it meant to go hungry in a rat-infested dugout? How many of them spent sleepless, frightened nights, ducking shells and shrapnel and machine gun bullets? How many of them parried a bayonet thrust of an enemy? How many of them were wounded or killed in battle?

"Out of war nations acquire additional territory, if they are victorious. They just take it. This newly acquired territory promptly is exploited by the few, the selfsame few who wrung dollars out of blood in the war. The general public shoulders the bill.

"And what is this bill?

"This bill renders a horrible accounting. Newly placed gravestones. Mangled bodies. Shattered minds. Broken hearts and homes. Economic instability. Depression and all its attendant miseries. Backbreaking taxation for generations and generations.

"For a great many years, as a soldier, I had a suspicion that war was a racket; not until I retired to civil life did I fully realize it. Now that I see the international war clouds gathering, as they are today, I must face it and speak out."

These are the words of Smedley Darlington Butler in his book, *War is a Racket*.

He goes on, in chapter two, to discuss who makes the profits. He goes through all of the war industries. He talks about the powder people, the steel companies, Anaconda, copper companies, a little increase in profits of approximately 200 percent.

Does war pay? It paid them. But they aren't the only ones, he writes. There are still others. Leather, nickel, sugar. Chicago packers. The bankers. He goes through airplane and engine manufacturers. Shipbuilders.

He says that the Senate committee probe of the munitions industry and its wartime profits, despite its sensational disclosures, hardly has scratched the surface. Even so, it had some effect. The State Department has been studying "for some time" methods of keep-

ing out of war, and so the war department suddenly decides it has a wonderful plan to spring to limit the profits in wartime.

Then he asks the question, but what about a limitation on losses? As far, he writes, as I have been able to ascertain, there is nothing in the scheme to limit a soldier to the loss of but one eye, or one arm, or to limit his wounds to one or two or three. Or to limit the loss of life. Of course, the committee cannot be bothered with such trifling matters.

And then in chapter three, he asks, Who pays the bills? He says that the soldier pays the biggest part of the bill.

In chapter four he says, How do we smash this racket? He says a few profit and the many pay. But there is a way to stop it. It can be smashed effectively only by taking the profit out of war. And then he goes on to describe how that could be done.

He says, let the workers in the plants, let the CEOs of the corporations, let the Members of Congress who appropriate the money all get the same wages, all, even the generals and admirals. Let them get the same wages as the total monthly income of a soldier in the trenches. He says, when you can let the kings and the tycoons and the masters of business earn what the soldiers earn, then maybe we will not have war. Maybe we can take the profit out of war and maybe we can put an end to the racket.

In chapter five, Smedley Butler tells us, I do not use these words, but he says, To hell with war.

I wanted to use some of my time, and I do not have much left, to talk about, maybe to introduce what I will talk about next month, and that is the depravities of war and how we can become inhuman and inhumane. It does not take war, but it certainly seems to be exacerbated by war.

I have a situation in my district where young black men already subdued, confined, in jail, tasered to death, how many black men, unarmed black men have been murdered on the streets of our country? The depravities of war. Who are we? What are we becoming? Why is this? I was told that I have to maintain decorum in this place. I think we as a people, we as a country, we as a Nation need to ask ourselves, what are we doing in Iraq? What are we doing around the world? What are we allowing the leadership of this country to do in our name? And when will we stop it?

#### BILL GOETZ

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of William H. Goetz, who, after 46 years of service to the City of Fort Mitchell, Kentucky, has announced his retirement from public service.

Bill Goetz' career began in 1964 when he began serving on the City Council of

South Fort Mitchell until that city merged with Fort Mitchell in 1967. He continued to serve as a council member for a combined total of 18 years, until 1981 when he was elected mayor.

William Goetz was mayor of Fort Mitchell from 1982 until April of 1993 when he was appointed city administrator and held that position for 12 years, until announcing his recent retirement.

Mr. Goetz has also served the city throughout his career as a member and an officer of numerous local and State organizations, including serving as president of the Municipal Government League of Northern Kentucky, president of the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission, chairman of the board of the Kentucky Municipal Risk Management Association, and president of the Kentucky League of Cities, a great record of public service.

Mr. Goetz has shown a devotion to employee relations and spearheaded efforts to improve employee benefits, which in turn allows the city to retain its seasoned employees, a great workforce with a long history of good service.

A devoted family man, Bill Goetz spends much of his free time with a large, extended family cheering on the Cincinnati Reds and the Cincinnati Bengals football team.

The retirement of William Goetz after over four and a half decades of public service will result in his being greatly missed by elected officials, employees, residents, longtime associates and friends of the city. He is a consummate professional who has always been a pleasure to work with, held a wealth of knowledge, demonstrated a will to help others and a will to continually serve the community. I am sure that that will continue long into the future.

Thank you, Bill, for your service.

□ 1630

#### NUCLEAR ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the subject that I want to spend a few moments talking about this afternoon really began for our country in 1962. We were still testing nuclear weapons then, and for the first time the United States tested a weapon above the atmosphere. This weapon was detonated over Johnston Island in the Pacific. This was a part of a series of tests called the Fishbowl Series, and this was Operation Starfish in 1962. We had no prior experience with the detonation of a weapon above the atmosphere. We prepared for this test with airplanes and ships using radar and theodolites and instrumentation to measure the effects on the ground from a blast that was some 400 kilometers in altitude.

In conversations just today with Dr. Lowell Wood from Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, I learned more of the details of the results of that test. They had not anticipated the magnitude of the effects at the ground under the blast; so many of their instruments simply pegged and they were not able to get a clear indication of the effects. I might note that the Soviets had extensive testing experience with EMP over their own territory. They had a much larger territory than we and some of it quite remote; so they were able to instrument more extensively and had a lot more experience than we have had. This was our first and only experience with a superatmospheric detonation of a nuclear weapon.

The effects over Hawaii, which was about 800 miles away, included several totally unexpected things; so there was no instrumentation on Hawaii to record the effects.

So all they can divine from the effects is what happened. Some street lights went out, and analysis after the fact indicated that these were the street lights that were oriented so that there was a very long line effect. In other words, the wires feeding the street lights constituted a very long antenna which received the signals from the detonation in space such that there was arcing and some of the street lights went out. This was investigated, and some of the failures were retained and were shown to a commission that I will talk about in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, that spent 2 years studying these effects and the risk to our military and to our country.

There were other effects in communications and so forth. As I said, none of this was expected; so there was no instrumentation. We have since tried to determine the effects of what is called electromagnetic pulse produced by a nuclear detonation. We have done that with laboratory devices, some of them quite large that could expose a whole airplane, but none of them obviously large enough to include miles and miles of long-line effect.

The EMP pulse at that distance was estimated to be about five kilovolts per meter. We will have occasion in a little bit to talk about that in light of present capabilities. Because there was intense activity above the atmosphere, the Van Allen belts were pumped up; so there were a number of low Earth orbit satellites that decayed very rapidly as they passed through the Van Allen belts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to kind of put what we are going to say in context. So I want to indicate here some of the seriousness of EMP and its implications. In 1999, I sat in a hotel room in Vienna, Austria. I was there with 10 other Members of Congress and several staff members. We had there three members of the Russian Duma and a representative of Slobodan Milosevic. This was just prior to the resolution of the Kosovo conflict. We developed with them a framework agreement that was

adopted about 5 days later by the G-8, which the Members may remember ended the Kosovo conflict.

One of the members of the Russian Duma was Vladimir Lukin, who was well known to this country because he was the ambassador here at the end of Bush I and the beginning of the Clinton administration. At that time he was a very senior member of the Russian Duma. He was very angry and sat for 2 days in that hotel room with his arms crossed looking at the ceiling. We had not early asked the Russians for help and they felt offended about that, and the statement he made expressing that sentiment was that "you spit on us. Now why should we help you?" And then he made a statement that stunned us. The leader of that delegation was the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who speaks and understands some Russian. And when Vladimir Lukin was speaking, he turned to me and he said, "Did you hear what he said?"

Of course I heard what he said, but I did not understand it because I do not understand Russian.

But then it was translated, and this is what he said: "If we really wanted to hurt you with no fear of retaliation, we would launch an SLBM," which if it was launched in a submarine at sea, we really would not know for certain where it came from. "We would launch an SLBM, we would detonate a nuclear weapon high above your country, and we would shut down your power grid and your communications for 6 months or so."

The third-ranking communist was there in the country. His name is Alexander Shurbanov, and he smiled and said, "And if one weapon would not do it, we have some spares." I think the number of those spares now is something like 6,000 weapons.

This likely consequence of a high-altitude nuclear burst was corroborated by Dr. Lowell Wood, who in a field hearing at the Johns Hopkins University applied physics laboratory, made the observation that a burst like this above our atmosphere creating this electromagnetic pulse would be like a giant continental time machine turning us back to the technology of 100 years ago. It is very obvious that the population of today in its distribution could not be supported by the technology of 100 years ago. And I asked Dr. Wood, I said, "Dr. Wood, clearly the technology of 100 years ago could not support our present population in its distribution," and his unemotional response was, "Yes, I know. The population will shrink until it can be supported by the technology."

Just a word, Mr. Speaker, about what this EMP is. It is very much like a really giant solar storm. All of us are familiar with solar storms and with the disruption to our communication systems. And this is like a really giant solar storm. It is kind of like really intense static electricity everywhere all at once, all over the whole country. It

is sort of like a lightning strike that is not just isolated to one spot. Different than a lightning strike in terms of the intensities and so forth and the spectrum, but it would be everywhere all at once over a very large area.

I have here in front of me the report, and I will have occasion to refer to that again a little later, the report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack. This is the executive summary. The report itself is very thick and there is a big classified addendum to the big report. And I just want to turn to one page here, and this is page 4, and it says: "What is significant about an EMP attack is that one or a few high-altitude nuclear detonations can produce EMP effects that can potentially disrupt or damage electronic and electrical systems over much of the United States virtually simultaneously at a time determined by an adversary."

I talked a little bit about what EMP is. It produces a large number of Compton electrons above our atmosphere which are trapped by the magnetic fields around the Earth. They move at the speed of light. The prompt effects are such that if the voltage is high enough, all electronic equipment within line of sight is damaged or destroyed. These are called prompt effects. And, of course, satellites are very soft because it costs about \$10,000 a pound to launch a satellite; so they do not launch a lot of hardening on the satellite if they do not need to.

So all of the satellites within line of sight would be taken out by prompt effects. It would not go so high, by the way, as the satellites that are 22,500 miles above the Earth. And it would pump up the Van Allen belts so that satellites that were not in line of sight would die very quickly and one could not reconstitute the satellite network by launching new ones because they also would die quickly.

Let me show a chart here that shows the effects of this bomb exploding over the United States, and this shows a single weapon. This shows a single weapon detonated at the northwest corner of Iowa, and it shows it at about 600 kilometers high, and this would blanket all of the United States. And the concentric circles here, not true circles because there is a little distortion of the electrical fields by the magnetic waves around the Earth, but these represent the intensity of the field that is produced by this. At the center we can see it is 100 percent. But even out at the margins of our country, it is down to 50 percent.

Now, a little later I will show a statement from some Russian generals that were reviewed by the people who put together this report, and they said that the Russians had developed weapons that produced 200 kilovolts per meter. Remember, the effects in Hawaii were judged to be the result of five kilovolts per meter. So this is a force about 200 times higher. The Russian generals

said that they believed that to be several times higher than the hardening that we had provided for our military platforms that they could resist EMP.

Others know about EMP. I did not want anybody to believe that we were letting the genie out of the bottle and others did not know about that. I mentioned earlier the statement by Vladimir Lukin, the Russian member of their Duma, and this is the statement that I referred to here, and that was in May 2, 1999: "Chinese military writings described EMP as the key to victory and described scenarios where EMP is used against U.S. aircraft carriers in the conflict over Taiwan." So it is not like our potential enemies do not know that this exists. The Soviets had very wide experience with this, and there is a lot of information in the public domain relative to this.

"A survey of worldwide military and scientific literature sponsored by the commission," that is the commission that wrote this report, "found widespread knowledge about EMP and its potential military utility including in Taiwan, Israel, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea."

□ 1645

Terrorist information warfare includes using the technology of directed energy weapons. These are little weapons that produce an EMP-like effect, but over a very much more restricted area, and also electromagnetic pulse produced from nuclear weapons.

By the way, an enemy no more sophisticated than Saddam Hussein would need no more than a tramp steamer, a Scud missile and a crude nuclear weapon like is probably available in North Korea or might be bought or stolen from some Russian source. That would not shut down the whole United States, because the Scud missile could not carry it high enough, but it would certainly shut down the whole Northeast.

By the way, this is not like the Northeast blackout that we had a couple of years ago. This would produce damage that you would not recover from simply by turning a switch. It would probably destroy large transformers. These very large transformers are made to order, and if you need one, they will build you one, not in this country, we do not build the big ones anymore, they will build you one over in Europe or Scandinavia, and it will take maybe a year-and-a-half to 2 years to get it. So it is not like you are going to recover from this tomorrow.

Iran has tested launching of a Scud missile from a surface vessel, a launch mode that could support a national or transnational EMP attack against the United States.

We have a second chart which shows more of the evidence that potential enemies out there know that this is a potential weapon.

"If the world's industrial countries fail to devise effective ways to defend themselves against dangerous elec-

tronic assaults, then they will disintegrate within a few years. 150,000 computers belong to the U.S. Army. If the enemy forces succeed in infiltrating the information network of the U.S. Army, then the whole organization would collapse, the American soldiers could not find food to eat, nor would they be able to fire a single shot."

I kind of think they would be able to find food to eat. This is from an Iranian journal, so you know they know about this and they are thinking about this.

"Terrorist information warfare includes using the technology of directed energy weapons, magnetic pulse." I referred to that earlier.

Iran has conducted tests with its Shahab-3 missile that have been described as failures by the Western media because the missiles did not complete their ballistic trajectories, but were deliberately exploded at high altitude. This, of course, would be exactly what you would want to do if you were going to use an EMP weapon.

Today we are very much concerned, Mr. Speaker, about asymmetric weapons. We are a big, powerful country. Nobody can contend with us shoulder-to-shoulder, face-to-face. So all of our potential adversaries are looking for what we refer to as asymmetric weapons. That is a weapon that overcomes our superior capabilities. There is no asymmetric weapon that has anywhere near the potential of EMP.

Iran described these tests as successful. We said they were a failure because they blew up in flight. They described them as successful. Of course, they would be, if Iran's intent was practicing for an EMP attack.

Iran's Shahab-3 is a medium-range mobile missile that could be driven on to a freighter and transported to a point near the United States for an EMP attack. I might state that an early use of EMP is a common occurrence in Russia and Chinese war games.

I just would like to spend a moment or two talking about kind of the history of how we got here and why the big concern about EMP and the risk that it poses to us. I mentioned Operation Starfish in 1962.

Then we really had a scary event which we did not know about for quite some time that happened in 1995 when there was a Norwegian weather rocket that was set off. The Norwegians had told the Russians that they were going to fire this weapon, but that did not get to the proper level. When the weapon was fired, it was interpreted by the Russians as a potential first strike of the United States against them and they had alerted their nuclear missile response. They came very close to launching that, and we did not know about that until some time after.

In 1997 I had a very interesting experience. I am on the Committee on Armed Services. This was during the Clinton administration, and he had set up a Commission on Critical Infrastructure. General Marsh, retired, was

chairing that Commission on Critical Infrastructure. This was infrastructure that was so critical that if an enemy could take it out, we would be very much disadvantaged by it. I asked him about EMP, had they looked at that?

His answer was, yes, they looked at it.

Well?

He said, well, we did not think there was a high probability that would happen, so we did not continue to look at it anymore.

I told him, gee, with that attitude, if you have not already, I am sure when you go home tonight you are going to cancel the fire insurance on your home.

What one needs when there is the potential for a very high-impact, low-probability event, is what we call insurance. I think that every American citizen has the right to ask their government, have you made the proper insurance investment to protect me, to protect my country, in the event, which we hope is not a high probability, in the event that there is an EMP attack against our country?

Your home burning, by the way, is not a high probability event. You may have a \$300,000 home and it may cost you \$300 for fire insurance for the year. So you can do the simple arithmetic that tells you the insurance company does not expect very many homes to burn that year.

Then the next event in this little timeline was my trip to Vienna, Austria, when I met there in that hotel room with Members of the Russian Duma. In 2001 we had some tests at Aberdeen with a device that was made using only the equipment that a terrorist might buy from Radio Shack or a place like that to see if you could put together a directed energy weapon, a weapon, by the way, that if sophisticated enough one might drive down Wall Street and take out all the computers in the financial market. It would not go further than that, but if it did that, that would, of course, be an enormous blow.

In 2001, the Commission was set up and then in 2004, last year, we have the report of the Commission.

I just would like to show you a chart now of the commissioners. We will not have time to talk about the capabilities of all of these commissioners, but I will assure you that these are all giants in their area. They were appointed from among the foremost scientists, experts and military officers in the United States to achieve a mix of talent on scientific aspects of EMP, nuclear weapon design, military implications of EMP and the effects of EMP on civilian and military infrastructures.

Dr. William Graham, the Commission chairman, was science advisor to President Reagan. He ran NASA and was one of the first scientists to study the EMP phenomenon when it was first discovered by its United States in 1962.

Commissioner John Foster, Johnny Foster, who designed most of the nuclear weapons in the inventory the

United States today, was a director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and for decades has been a close adviser to the Department of Defense on nuclear matters.

Dr. Lowell Wood is a member of the director's staff at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory where he inherited the scientific mantle of Dr. Edward Teller, the inventor of the hydrogen bomb.

I had a very interesting personal experience related to Dr. Lowell Wood. When I became interested a number of years ago in EMP and the potential implications, I knew that Tom Clancy, who lives in Maryland and he has come to do several events for me, I knew that he had a novel in which EMP was one of the sequences in his novel. I know that Tom Clancy does very good research. So I called to ask him about EMP and its implications.

He said that if I had read his book, I probably knew as much about EMP as he knew, but he was going to refer me to what he said was in his view was the smartest person hired by the U.S. Government, and that was Dr. Lowell Wood. So Dr. Lowell Wood comes with great recommendations.

Commissioner Richard Lawson was a USAF general, served on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and was Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the U.S.-European Command.

Dr. Joan Woodard, I had a very interesting experience with Dr. Woodard. I was visiting my son and daughter and children out in Albuquerque, he works at the Sandia Labs, and he brought home a little note talking about a seminar they were having which was exploring some issues that I thought would be relevant to the work that the Commission was doing. I did not know at that time that she was a member of the Commission.

So I asked for a briefing, and I spent 5 hours in a classified briefing at Sandia Labs. And it was not just Dr. Joan Woodard, it was a large number of people at the labs there that were focusing primarily on the national infrastructure consequences of this.

What I would like to do now is go through some of the statements and recommendations of the report. The next chart shows the threat and the nature and magnitude of EMP threats within the next 15 years.

On the right you see the coverage that is produced by weapons detonated at various altitudes. I mentioned 600 kilometers. Actually 500 kilometers pretty much covers the margins of our country and, of course, the lower the altitude you detonate it, the less area that it covers, but the higher will be the intensity of the pulse that is produced.

This is a direct quote from the EMP Commission report: "EMP is one of a small number of threats that may hold at risk the continued existence of today's U.S. civil society."

Now, that is couched in the careful kind of scientific terms, but what that

really means is that a really robust EMP laydown, which, as Vladimir Lukin in that hotel room in Vienna, Austria said, would shut down our power grid and communications for 6 months or so. And if one weapon would not do it, as Alexander Shaponov said, four absolutely would do it, particularly with the power of the weapons that the Russian generals say that they have developed.

What this would do is to produce a society in which the only person you could talk to was the person next to you, unless you happened to be a ham operator with a vacuum tube set, which, by the way, is 1 million times less susceptible to EMP than your present equipment that the hams use. And the only way you could get anywhere was to walk, because, you see, if the pulse is intense enough, it turns off all the computers in your car. There will be no electricity, so even if the car ran, you could not get gas.

By the way, if you have a car that still has a coil and distributor, you are probably okay, because those are pretty robust structures compared to today's cars with so much microelectronics in them.

It would disrupt our military forces and our ability to project military power. For the last decade, Mr. Speaker, we have been waiving hardening on essentially all of our military platforms because it costs maybe as little as 1 percent, maybe like 5 percent more to harden. It can be done. That is the good news story. If you do not harden, you can get 5 percent more weapons systems. And since we have had so little money during those years, the Pentagon opted to run this risk. With terrorists about, I think that is probably a risk we do not want to continue to run.

The number of U.S. adversaries capable of EMP attack is greater than during the Cold War. We may look back with some fondness on the Cold War. We then had only one potential adversary. We knew him quite well.

□ 1700

Now we have who knows how many potential adversaries, and they come from very different cultures than we, and we have a great deal of difficulty in understanding them and communicating with them.

Potential adversaries are aware of the EMP's strategic attack option. I started, Mr. Speaker, with talking about the fact that I was not letting the genie out of the bottle. Ninety-nine percent of Americans may not know very much about EMP, but I will assure you, Mr. Speaker, that 100 percent of our potential enemies know all about EMP. I think that the American people need to know about EMP because they need to demand that their government do the prudent thing so that we will be less and less susceptible, less and less at risk to an EMP attack year by year. The threat is not adequately addressed in U.S. national



and homeland security programs. Not only is it not adequately addressed; it is usually ignored, not even mentioned, and it certainly needs to be considered.

I might note that Senator John Kyl, with whom I served in the House on the Committee on Armed Services, wrote just a couple of weeks ago a very nice editorial in the Washington Post, and we will have his quote a little later, on EMP effects and how we need to be about preparing ourselves for that.

Terrorists could steal, purchase, or be provided a nuclear weapon and perform an EMP attack against the United States simply by launching a primitive Scud missile off a freighter near our shores. We do not need to be thinking about missiles coming over the Pole. There are thousands of ships out there, particularly in the North Atlantic shipping lanes, and any one of them could have a Scud missile on board. If you put a canvas over it, we cannot see through the thinnest canvas. We would not know whether it was bailed hay or bananas or a Scud launcher. You cannot see through any cover on ship. The Commission on the Emerging Ballistic Missile Threat chaired by Secretary Rumsfeld before he was Secretary, and Dr. Bill Graham, the chairman of this commission was his vice-chair, found that ships had been modified so that they had missile-launching tubes in ordinary freighters. You can read that in their report.

Scud missiles can be purchased on the world market today for less than \$100,000. Al Qaeda is estimated to own about 80 freighters, so all they need, Mr. Speaker, is \$100,000, which I am sure they can get, for the missile and a crude nuclear weapon.

Certain types of low-yield nuclear weapons can generate potentially catastrophic EMP effects. These certain types of weapons are weapons that have been designed for enhanced EMP effects. They may have little explosive effect, but very high EMP effects over wide geographic areas, and designs for various such weapons may have been illicitly trafficked for a quarter of a century. We are certain that the Chinese have them. Of course the Russians have them; they developed probably better or at least as good designs as we developed. We designed them, by the way, but never built them. The Russians we understand have both designed and built them, and we now believe those designs to be pretty widespread out around the world.

The next chart shows the comments from the Russian generals, and to protect the Russian generals we have redacted their names. But the commission met with Russian generals, and they claim that Russia has designed a super-EMP nuclear weapon capable of generating 200 kilovolts per meter. And the Russian generals told our commission people that they believe that to be several times higher than the level two, which we had hardened our weapons systems; even those that are hardened and, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker,

most of our weapons systems now procured are not hardened.

Russian, Chinese, and Pakistani scientists are working in North Korea and could enable that country to develop an EMP weapon in the near future. Now, this is not what the commission said; this is what the commission reported the Russian generals to have said.

The next chart shows additional comments from the EMP Commission report. States or terrorists may well calculate that using a nuclear weapon for EMP attack offers the greatest utility. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that a country could use a nuclear weapon against the United States that would be as devastating as using it to produce an EMP lay-down. I had not noted, but I should note, Mr. Speaker, that there is no effect on you or me from this weapon. We are quite immune to that. We will not be damaged by that. Buildings will not be damaged by that. It will affect only electric and electronic equipment.

EMP offers a bigger bang for the buck. Now, this is from their report; I am not saying this. EMP offers a bigger bang for the buck against U.S. military forces in a regional conflict or a means of damaging the U.S. homeland. EMP may be less provocative of U.S. massive retaliation compared to a nuclear attack on a U.S. city that inflicts many prompt casualties.

Just a couple of words about this. As Vladimir Lukin said, if it were launched from the ocean, we would not know who launched it. So against whom would we retaliate? Even if we knew who launched it, Mr. Speaker, if all they have done is to disable our computers, do we respond in kind, or do you incinerate their grandmothers and their babies? This would be a really tough call. Responding in kind might do very little good. There is no other country in the world that has anything like our sophistication in electronic equipment, and no other country in the world is so dependent as we are on our national infrastructure. So this is a real problem and a big incentive to use this weapon without fear of retaliation, as Vladimir Lukin says, with no fear of retaliation.

EMP could, compared to a nuclear attack on the city, kill many more Americans in the long run from indirect effects of collapsed infrastructures of power, communications, transportation, food, and water. Can you imagine our country, Mr. Speaker, with 285 million people, no electricity, and there will be no electricity, no transportation, no communication? The only way you can go anywhere is to walk, and the only person you can talk to is the person next to you. What would we do? How many of our people might not survive the transition from that situation to where you had established a sort of infrastructure that could support civil society as we know it today.

Strategically and politically, an EMP attack can threaten entire re-

gional or national infrastructures that are vital to U.S. military strength and societal survival, challenge the integrity of allied regional coalitions, and pose an asymmetrical threat more dangerous to the high-tech West than to rogue states. This makes the point that I was making that because we are the most sophisticated, we are the most vulnerable.

Technically and operationally, EMP attacks can compensate for deficiencies in missile accuracy, fusing range, reentry, velocity design, target location, intelligence, and missile defense penetration. We are really superior in all of these areas, and none of our enemies out there, except for Russia and China, and we would not expect an attack like this from either of them, but there is nobody else out there who really can be very good shots with their missiles.

But what the EMP Commission report is pointing out is, they do not need to be. Anywhere over the northeastern United States will shut down all of the northeastern United States, and anywhere near the middle of our country, you can miss it by 100 miles and it really will not matter. Anything near the middle of our country detonated high enough with the right kind of weapon will blanket the whole country with an EMP force that could knock out all of our electronic equipment.

The next chart shows some other comments in the EMP report. One or a few high-altitude nuclear detonations can produce EMP simultaneously over wide geographical areas. As the chart we showed earlier, the whole country can be blanketed with one about 600 kilometers high.

The thing they were really concerned about, because we have a very sophisticated infrastructure with lots of interdependencies, they were really concerned about the cascading failure, unprecedented cascading failure of our electronics-based infrastructures, which could result in power, energy, transport, telecom, and financial systems and are particularly vulnerable and interdependent. And if one of them comes down, if you bring down the power grid, Mr. Speaker, you have brought down all of these other parts of our national infrastructure. EMP disruption of these sectors could cause large-scale infrastructure failures for all aspects of the Nation's life.

Now, these are not my words; these are taken from the EMP Commission report. This commission was set up as a part of public law, and that is noted here on this chart. Both civilian and military capabilities depend on these infrastructures. Without adequate protection, recovery could be prolonged months to years for recovery. And here on the right is a little depiction showing some, and there are more than that, showing some of the interrelationships. For instance, electric power is not shown as important for water or for banking and finance, and

for government services; and of course it is. So if you do not have electric power, for instance, you do not have any of these other things.

There was a number of years ago a scientist by the name of Harrison Scott Brown. I think that he worked at CalTech, and he offered a series of seminars called the "Next 100 Years." This was during the Cold War. And one of the questions that it was appropriate to ask during the Cold War was, What would you do after the nuclear attack? You may remember, Mr. Speaker, your parents talking about the backyard shelters that were built during the 1960s. Sometime after that I went to work for IBM and they were still talking about the fact that IBM had loaned its employees money interest-free to build a backyard shelter. There was a real concern that there could be a bolt out of the blue and that we could have a nuclear attack. We had a big civil defense organization with lots of shelters. They were stocked, and you were given pamphlets and you were told where to go.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that today, with the potential for terrorist attack, we need to turn back a few pages and learn from our experience during the Cold War when we recognized that the more prepared an individual and a family was to be self-sufficient during that attack, the stronger we would be as a whole; and I think that we could profit, at least have a more intense focus on civil defense in our homeland security efforts.

Harrison Scott Brown was concerned about what you would do after you came out of the fallout shelter and how you would reconstitute your society to reestablish the kind of an infrastructure that you had before the attack. His concern was that in the United States, and this was a number of years ago, his concern would be even greater were he alive today, his concern then was that we had developed such a sophisticated, interrelated infrastructure, that if it came down like a house of cards, that it might be very difficult, maybe, he thought, and I will explain in a moment why, maybe impossible to reestablish that infrastructure. Because, he noted, that this infrastructure was built up gradually from very simple to very complex, when there was available to us a rich resource of raw materials, high-quality iron ore. That is all gone. Our best ores now, I think, are ½ of 1 percent taconite ores.

□ 1715

When oil essentially oozed out of the ground, when the water washed the dirt away, you could see coal exposed in some of the hills of Pennsylvania. The oil now is deep and hard to get or offshore or in the Arctic. All the good coal has been burned. Now, to get oil and to get coal, we have to have the infrastructure. You have to have diesel fuel shipped to you. You have to have large excavators.

His concern was that if our infrastructure collapsed as a result of a nu-

clear attack, today we are talking about an EMP attack, which does not blow up buildings, but it shuts down the infrastructure because it would destroy, disrupt all of the electronic equipment if the pulse was high enough; and a determined, sophisticated enemy could make sure that it was high enough.

So he was concerned that maybe it would not be possible now without that high-quality, readily available resource of raw materials that might be very difficult without massive help from other parts of the world that we could reconstitute our society.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we need to be looking at that threat to our country today. I am sure it is no less a threat now than it was when Harrison Scott Brown was holding those seminars.

In 2004, the EMP Commission met with very senior Russian officers, and we showed that on the sign. They warned that the knowledge and technology to develop what they called super EMP weapons had been transferred to North Korea and that North Korea could probably develop these weapons in the near future, within a few years.

The Russian officers said that the threat that would be posed to global security by a North Korean armed with super EMP weapons was, in their view, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, in your view and mine, unacceptable.

You know, why use EMP, as we noted in a previous chart? A terrorist or rogue state might be so inaccurate that they could not even use a nuclear weapon to take out New York City. They might hit the countryside somewhere near. But it would not really matter with that low accuracy if they were doing an EMP laydown. Because anywhere over New England would be quite good enough, and there is no way that they could do as much damage to our country by a ground burst, even if it hit the city, than if they could do a high altitude burst, which produced EMP and took down, if it was intense enough, all of our infrastructure.

EMP has such a wide area of effect that if the weapon is large enough or several are used, covering potentially an entire continent, that even a highly inaccurate missile could not miss its target in an EMP effect. EMP attack involves exoatmospheric detonation, meaning that attack, this is really interesting, Mr. Speaker, this attack would occur before the weapon ever reentered the atmosphere. So even if we were really good at taking out weapons before they hit us, it really would not matter, because this is detonated before it starts to reenter. So any weapon that would take out a missile on its final descent would be useless, because it has already detonated and the damage is done at altitude.

Increased dependence on advanced electronic systems results in the potential for an increased EMP vulnerability. And what this does is to make

that attack more attractive to our assailants. The fact that we are ever more sophisticated and therefore ever more vulnerable makes it ever more attractive to our adversaries, because this really becomes the ultimate asymmetric weapon.

EMP threatens the ability of the United States and western nations to project influence and military power, because a third-world country with a crude missile and a crude nuclear weapon could, in effect, hold us hostage. This is why it is so important that we stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

EMP can cause catastrophic damage to the Nation by destroying the electric power infrastructure, causing cascading failures in the infrastructure for everything: telecommunications, energy, transportation, finance, food, and water.

I live on a farm. I cannot even get a drink of water without electricity, because the pump in my well that supplies my water has to have electricity. So we are all really dependent on this infrastructure.

Degradation, and this is really minimized, degradation of the infrastructures could have irreversible effects on the country's ability to support its population, and then millions could die. That is true.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the EMP Commission report is really a good news story. So far what we have been talking about does not really sound like good news, does it? It sounds like the worst of all news that you could get. But there really is good news here, and the good news is that we do not have to be this vulnerable. It is really not all that expensive to protect our systems against EMP. You just have to do it.

But we have a problem, and that is the cheapest way to do it is when you are making them, if you design it in. Then it may cost as little as 1 percent more. For really sophisticated electronic stuff, probably not more than 10 percent more. But if you are trying to add it after it is built, then it can cost you as much as the device itself, which means that we need to start, you can only do what you can do, and we need to start in our national infrastructure by deciding what is most essential to protect and then expeditiously protecting that as fast as we can.

Every new water system we put in, every new sewage system we put in, every new power line we run, every new distribution system we put in needs to be hardened. It is not all that expensive to do. You just need to do it.

Now we have hardened in the military our command and control. We are pretty sure that we can talk to each other after an EMP laydown. But that does not give me much solace, Mr. Speaker, because that is the equivalent of me having my brain and spinal cord work, but my arms and my hands will not work. I am not sure just having the capability of my brain communicating

with my spinal cord does me much good if my arms and my legs will not respond to those signals.

The EMP Commission has proposed a 5-year plan that, if implemented, would protect the United States from the catastrophic consequences of EMP attack and make recovery possible at surprisingly modest cost.

I would like now to turn to a statement that was made by Dr. John Kyl. I mentioned his name earlier. Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, which I chair, his words in his op-ed piece, held a hearing on a major threat to the United States not only from terrorists but from rogue nations like North Korea.

An EMP attack is one of only a few ways that America could be essentially defeated by our enemies, terrorists or otherwise. Few if any people would die right away, but the long-term loss of electricity would essentially bring our society to a halt. Few can conceive of the possibility that terrorists could bring American society to its knees by knocking out our power supply from several miles in the atmosphere. But this time we have been warned, and we better be prepared to respond. We really do need to respond.

Here is another statement from Major Franz Gayl.

The impact that EMP is asymmetric in relation to our adversaries, now these are all in the public domain. I want to be very careful, Mr. Speaker, that I do not leave the impression that I am letting the genie out of the bottle. Ninety-nine percent of Americans may not know about EMP, but I will guarantee you 100 percent of our adversaries know about EMP. And we need to know about EMP, because to be forewarned is to be forearmed, and we need to do something about that.

The impact that EMP is asymmetric in relation to our adversaries, the less developed societies in North Korea, Iran and other potential EMP attack perpetrators are less electronically dependent and less specialized, while more capable of continued functionality in the absence of modern conveniences.

I do not know that outside of Pyongyang that many people in North Korea would even know if electricity went out. I am not sure they depend much on electricity.

Conversely, the United States would be subject to widespread paralysis and doubtful recovery following a surprise EMP attack. Therefore, terrorists and their coincidentally allied state sponsors may determine that, given just a few nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, that subjecting the United States to a potentially non-attributable EMP attack, we would not even know where it came from if it came from the oceans, is more desirable than the destruction of selected cities. Delayed mass lethality is assured over time through the cascade of EMPs' indirect

effects that would bring our highly specialized and urbanized society to a disorderly halt.

The vulnerability of the United States to EMP attack serves as the latest revelation that societal protections associated with our national security can no longer be assured by traditional nuclear deterrence and battlefield preparations on their own.

Let me put up now a conclusion chart. The EMP threat is one of a few potentially catastrophic threats to the United States. By taking action, the EMP threat can be reduced to manageable levels, but we should have started yesterday, Mr. Speaker. We just must start today.

U.S. strategy to address the EMP threat should balance prevention, preparation, protection and recovery. We need to be studying all four of these. Critical military capabilities must be survivable and endurable to underwrite U.S. strategy. If they can bring down our military, that really puts us at risk.

The 2006 Defense Authorization Bill contains a provision extending the EMP Commission to ensure that their recommendations will be implemented. We need to have them around to make sure that we are following through on their recommendations. Terrorists are looking for vulnerabilities to attack, and our civilian infrastructure is particularly susceptible to this kind of attack. It needs to be hardened.

When you have a weak underbelly, you are inviting attack there. They are going to attack at the weakest link, and our infrastructure complexity is certainly our weakest link. The Department of Homeland Security needs to identify critical infrastructures. What do we need to protect first?

Then we need to have a plan for what would we do if we had the EMP attack tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, the next year, 5 years from now. How far along would we be in protecting ourselves? But we need to have a plan for what we would do in the event that that happens.

The Department of Homeland Security also needs to develop a plan, I really want to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, to help citizens deal with such an attack should it occur. Each of us as individuals, each of us as families, each of us as a church group, each of us as a community, needs to have plans for what we would do in the event of an EMP attack. We need to know what we need to do to prepare so that we are not going to be a liability on the system. Our strength as a Nation is going to be greatly increased if each of us as a family, a church group, a community, is prepared so that we will be less susceptible to the loss of these infrastructure supports.

Mr. Speaker, this is really a good news story. We know about this problem. It has not happened yet. We have a great study with great detailed recommendations of what we need to be doing. The good news is that if we do

these things we will have reduced our vulnerability and we will have now taken from the enemy an enormous strategic capability that they now have because we are such a sophisticated society, depend so much on our infrastructure, and if they can bring down an infrastructure they can bring us down.

We have a mighty Army. It will not be much good if the folks back home do not have anything to eat.

Mr. Speaker, to be forewarned is to be forearmed. I am sure Americans will respond to this challenge. And challenges are really exhilarating. You feel really good at night if you have met a challenge and you have had some successes in meeting that challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a bright future ahead, and it is going to be even brighter if we respond appropriately to the warnings that are here.

#### PROBLEMS WITH CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LEVIN. The Dominican Republic-Central America Free Trade Agreement presents an important crossroads for trade policy. It involves issues broader than those, for example, relating to sugar or textiles; and indeed, as President Bush said recently, it involves issues beyond trade, including ramifications for the future path of democracy.

□ 1730

It is an important test for globalization. What has been unfolding in Latin America, including Central America, is that substantial portions of the citizenry are not benefiting from globalization. They have increasingly responded with votes at the ballot box or in the street. Doing so they have raised sharply an underlying issue and that is whether the terms of expanded trade need to be shaped to spread the benefits or simply to assume the trade expansion by itself will adequately work that out.

It is for these reasons, not more narrow interests, why the issue of core labor standards in CAFTA is important for Central America and for the United States of America. The way it is handled in CAFTA undermines the chance that the benefits of expanded trade will be broadly shared. The goal of globalization must be to expand markets and raise living standards, not promote a race to the bottom.

An essential part of this leveling up is the ability of workers in developing nations to have the freedom to join together, to have a real voice at work, so they can move up the economic ladder. This is not true in Central America where recent State Department and International Labor Organization reports confirm that the basic legal

framework is not in place to protect the rights of workers and enforcement of these defective laws is woefully inadequate. Regrettably, CAFTA as negotiated preserves the status quo or worse, because it says to these countries "enforce your own laws" when it comes to internationally recognized labor standards.

The Latin American region possesses the worst income inequality in the world. And four of the Central American nations rank among the top 10 in Latin America with the most serious imbalances. Poverty is rampant in these countries. The middle class is dramatically weak, as has been true in the persons of other nations including our own. This will not change unless workers can climb up the ladder and help develop a vibrant middle class.

A huge percentage of workers in this region are not actively benefiting from globalization because the current laws in these nations do not adequately allow them to participate fully in the workplace. The suppression of workers in the workplace also inhibits the steps necessary to promote democracy in society at large. The core labor and environmental provision in CAFTA that each country must merely enforce its own law is a double standard. This standard is not used anywhere else in CAFTA, whether as to intellectual property, tariff levels, or subsidies.

"Enforce your own laws" is a ticket to a race to the bottom. Such an approach is harmful all around for the inability of workers to earn enough, for we in the middle class so badly lacking in and needed by Central American countries, for American workers who resist competition based on suppression of workers in other countries and for our companies and our workers who need middle classes in other countries to purchase the goods and services that we produce.

CAFTA is a step backwards also from present trade agreements. The Caribbean Basin Initiative Standard states in determining whether to designate any country a benefit country under CPI, the President shall take into account "whether or not such country has taken or is taking steps to afford workers in that country, including any designated zone in that country, internationally recognized rights."

The GSP, Generalized System of Preference, standard is this: the President shall designate a country, a GSP beneficiary country if "such country has not taken or is not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights to workers in that country including any designated zone in that country."

So CAFTA is a step backward from these standards. The provisions in CAFTA on worker rights as currently negotiated are substantially weaker than current U.S. law and would replace that current law. I will give you an example. In Guatemala over 900 Del Monte banana workers were fired in 1990 for protesting labor conditions. A

GSP petition led USTR for the first time ever to self-initiate a worker rights review for Guatemala in October 2000. Guatemala subsequently passed labor reforms in April 2001 which included granting farm workers new rights to strike.

In preparation for CAFTA, however, Guatemala's constitutional courts struck down key parts of the 2001 labor reforms. In August of 2004, the court rescinded the authority of the ministry of labor of that country to impose fines for labor rights violation, a key element of the 2001 agreement. Under CAFTA, the U.S. would have no recourse to challenge that development.

Now, let me go on, if I might, to a next point and that relates to the examples of Morocco and Chile and Singapore because those agreements are often used as examples as to why we should vote for CAFTA. I supported the agreements with Chile, with Morocco, and with Singapore. The situations in each of those countries was very different from Central American countries.

Chile has the international labor standards incorporated in their laws and they enforce them. There is a vibrant labor movement and an active middle class. The same is essentially true in Singapore, anti-labor movements, workers have their right to associate if they want to organize, to form unions; and they have a tradition of a labor movement in Singapore.

Morocco, the question is asked, well, I voted for Morocco, why not CAFTA? And the answer is there are vast differences between the situations. Morocco took steps in the last years before the free trade agreement with them to truly, truly reorganize their labor laws. Also, Morocco has a tradition of a vibrant labor movement in the private sector as well as the public sector. So Central America is very different.

We voted, many of us on the Democratic side, for Morocco, Chile and Singapore; we believe in expanded trade as long as the terms of those of that trade agreement and of those trade agreements are shaped to spread the benefits across the population.

Let me say a word about Central American countries and the deficiencies in their laws, because much has been said of this and much was said today by our new USTR, a former colleague, Rob Portman. Look, USTR has tried to gloss over what the ILO says. They have tried to gloss over what is in the State Department reports themselves. But any objective look confirms that those reports say that the laws of those countries in terms of the basic international standards are defective. And this was spelled out in a letter that was sent by us on April 4 by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), and myself to the acting trade representative, Peter Allgeier.

Mr. Speaker, this letter will be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

What the reports show is exemplified in a fairly recent case, and I will refer to it briefly. It relates to port workers in El Salvador. In that case they tried to organize, they tried to be representative, they tried to bring about democratic rights within the workplace. Thirty-four of the workers were fired last December when they were trying to form a union. And not only did the law not require their reinstatement, but only severance pay, which is a cheap bargain for an employer who wants to violate rights.

But a month later, the labor ministry denied the labor union's registration petition since now there were only seven workers left. Others had been fired. El Salvador law requires at least 35 members to form a labor organization, a provision that itself has been criticized by the International Labor Organization.

I just ask everybody to read the letter that we sent to Mr. Allgeier and the attached analysis of laws from the ILO reports and State Department reports. President Bush has correctly talked about freedom and democracy. He has said that everywhere. But what this CAFTA does is to sanction the status quo where there is no democracy in the workplace.

President Bush last month urged a vote for CAFTA because it would bring "stability and security" to the region.

I think the opposite is true. If workers are suppressed, it is a step towards insecurity and towards instability. Labor market freedom is a source of security, undercutting insecurity. What is a threat, what is a real threat to undemocratic forces, those who do not believe in them, is democracy in the workplace.

The President likes to quote the writings of Natan Sharansky, who has been minister in Israel until recently. Natan Sharansky says that a test of democracy is whether somebody can arise in the town square and speak his or her mind without punishment. If you use that test to the workplace, most places in Central America, the answer is there is no democracy. If somebody raises their voice too often, they are fired.

Now, let me just say a word about another argument that is used and that is, well, the problem is enforcement and the United States is going to help the nations of Central America with their enforcement. We are going to provide monies so that there is a stronger department of labor, et cetera, et cetera.

Well, today, Rob Portman, our ambassador, outlined a number of proposals for more funding to help CAFTA countries in technical assistance to strengthen enforcement of labor laws. He said the problem is not labor laws; it is enforcement. The correct analysis is there is a deep problem in their laws and a severe problem with the enforcement of flawed laws. But when you

look at what was urged today by Mr. Portman, and I do not question his good faith about it, but I do question the credibility of it because it is the record, not the rhetoric, that really matters. And the record of this administration in providing technical assistance for the strengthening of labor unions in other countries is miserable.

This year, I just give a few examples, this year President Bush proposed crippling cuts to the budget for the International Labor Affairs Bureau known as ILAB. He proposed cutting funding by 87 percent from \$94 million to \$12 million.

□ 1745

According to the President, the 2006 budget, he quotes, "returns the agency to its original mission of research, analysis and advocacy." Well, what that means is there is not any emphasis on technical assistance.

Also, the President's five budget requests in previous years proposed funding cuts for ILAB of more than 50 percent.

So I do not believe that the answer is simply more money going to agencies in other countries. I think the laws have to be in order. The regulations must not strangle efforts of people to assert their freedom in the labor market, but I do think better enforcement would be useful of good laws. The record of the administration in terms of technical assistance is terribly weak, in fact.

Now, let me discuss another issue that has come up when we discuss CAFTA. Increasingly, this administration has used our trade challenges from China as a reason to vote for CAFTA. This is happening more and more. It is not credible. It is at best boot strap. Look, we have to shape trade policy so that there can be effective competition with China, that is for sure. That relates to currency, and we just a short time ago had, I think, a rather ineffective meeting with the administration on the currency issue.

It also includes trade in apparel and textiles. We have seen a major influx of apparel from China with the end of the quotas. In order to have an effective trade policy, vis-a-vis, China, in the apparel and textile areas, we have to do the following.

Number one, we have to actively use remedies that were written into the agreement with China in its accession to the WTO. We worked hard to get those provisions into the WTO China accession agreement, and the administration has hesitated to use them effectively. They did not effectively anticipate this problem, and when the problem really sprouted, their response initially was very weak.

Second point regarding this: We do need to have and take steps to bring about a strong Caribbean apparel and textile structure, Caribbean including the United States. To do that, one of the steps that is necessary is to have compliance with international core

labor standards. That would be a source of strength, not of weakness. It would be trying to compete and compete effectively, rather than trying to compete with China as to who can most suppress worker rights.

In that regard, I do think we ought to look at what is sometimes pointed to, and that is, the Clinton legacy because I have read some articles that have said that those of us who have raised this set of issues about globalization, who have raised this set of issues about shaping trade policy and have applied it to this critical step, vis-a-vis, CAFTA, that those of us who are doing that are taking a step backwards from where the Clinton administration was. The contrary is true. The contrary is really what this is all about.

For example, Jordan. Today, Ambassador Portman, and I am glad to call him ambassador now, he was a colleague, said that the Jordan agreement is not as strong as CAFTA when it comes to core labor standards. That simply is an incorrect analysis of Jordan. Jordan has a clear reference to the core standards: child labor, forced labor, anti-discrimination and the right of workers to associate and to bargain collectively. It has references to those five core labor standards in the Jordan agreement, number one.

Number two, Jordan has a provision to make sure that Jordan cannot slip backwards, cannot move away from that standard. That is not true in CAFTA. Enforce your own laws, it can be present laws or revised laws that are even worse.

Thirdly, as to enforcement, it is not at all correct to say that the provisions in CAFTA, that those provisions are nearly as strong as was negotiated with Jordan. Essentially the Jordan FTA, the U.S.-Jordan FTA said that each country could take the necessary steps to enforce the obligations of the other, and it is true the Bush administration later entered a letter, a side letter, that put some brakes on the ability of the Bush administration to implement the Jordan agreement, but that is not what was negotiated.

What President Clinton did increasingly in his later years was to say to the world, I favor expanded trade, I believe in it, it has to be done in ways that shape so that there is a leveling up and not down. That is language that he used in his speeches. He referred to them at the University of Chicago speech, and that was the flavor of his speech at Davos. I was there when he gave the speech. He spent half of his time talking about the benefits of expanded trade. He also spent the second half saying if those benefits were going to be real and move globalization ahead, there needed to be, he said, a leveling up and not a leveling down.

When people say we cannot impose standards on other countries, and that was said I think it was yesterday or maybe earlier today by the chairman of our committee, I do not understand that. Trade agreements, like any other

contract, involve imposition. We are going to have to change laws as a result of trade agreements. That was true under the Uruguay Round agreements. It is true of tariffs. We are going to have to change our laws regarding tariffs.

Now we are not talking about imposing American standards in CAFTA. What we are talking about is placing internationally recognized standards in the declaration of the ILO that every country involved here, Dominican Republic, Central American, U.S., has endorsed putting them into the agreement, in the body of the agreement enforceably with reasonable transition. That is important.

So let it be clear, the opposition to CAFTA, as negotiated, is not being led by those the administration likes to dismiss as in "protectionists" or "isolationists." Those shoes do not fit. The opposition leadership involves those of us who have favored expanded trade and have helped to shape and pass trade agreements in the last decade.

For us, CAFTA is an important line in the sand, affecting the future effectiveness of globalization. If the U.S. does not seize the opportunity to shape the rule of trade and competition in CAFTA, it will have chosen simply to be on the receiving end of the consequences, both positive and negative of globalization.

I favor a CAFTA but not this agreement as it stands, and we can quickly fix this agreement by renegotiating CAFTA to include internationally recognized labor standards, with enforcement in a reasonable transition. In doing so, we would advance the interests of U.S. businesses and workers and expand the benefits of globalization beyond the status quo and any privileged minority in any of these countries.

We would take also an important step, and I want to emphasize this, an important step towards reestablishing a bipartisan foundation for trade. That bipartisan foundation has been eroded under this administration, and it is that bipartisan foundation that needs to be reestablished because it is so critical for tackling tough trade issues ahead, for example, in the Doha Round. We cannot tackle these tough issues of agriculture, various parts of agriculture, or of services, including financial services, we cannot tackle them, nontariff barriers, unless there is a solid, nonpartisan, bipartisan foundation. We cannot do it by trying to squeeze out a one vote majority.

Security, economic and political, is best achieved in the region of Central America. By closing the dangerous gap between rich and poor, by development of a real middle class and a larger middle class and by expansion of freedom operating in the workplace and spreading throughout the society, it did, by the way, not only in our country in Poland and so many other places.

I want to close by emphasizing what is at stake, that this security, economic and political, is in the self-interest of our country, of our businesses

and of our workers. We need to address this issue of core labor standards, not only for the benefit of the workers in the other countries, of the development of a so badly needed middle class in those countries, but also because our workers increasingly refuse to compete with countries where the workers are suppressed. That is eroding the support for international trade in this country, and we need to reaffirm its importance by reaffirming some basic principles. That is going to be good, as I said, for our country, for our businesses, and for our workers.

I am not sure of the timetable for CAFTA. What I am sure is as of today, it would not pass. There may be an effort to try to make it pass by all kinds of deals, which those of us who favor expanded trade would never agree to. It may be endeavored to pass through some kinds of deals unrelated to trade, offering this and that, unrelated again to trade. That would be a terrible mistake.

We have an opportunity here to reconfigure CAFTA in a way that would bring about strong bipartisan support and be a foundation for the development of stable relationships within Central America and the Dominican Republic and between them and ourselves.

Also, as I said, we would be able to reestablish the bipartisan foundation that once prevailed for international trade in this institution. Without it, CAFTA, in my judgment, should not and cannot pass, and there is likely trouble in tackling the other issues that need to be addressed boldly, honestly and effectively.

The material I referred to previously I will insert into the RECORD at this point.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, DC, April 4, 2005.

Hon. PETER ALLGEIER,  
Acting U.S. Trade Representative,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR ALLGEIER: In recent weeks, advocates for the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) have made assertions that the CAFTA countries' laws comply with basic, internationally-recognized rules that ensure common decency and fairness to working people. These advocates argue that the only outstanding issue concerning the rights of workers in the CAFTA countries is a lack of adequate enforcement of existing labor laws.

Unfortunately, CAFTA advocates' rhetoric is not supported by the facts. There are still no fewer than 20 areas in which the CAFTA countries' labor laws fail to comply with even the most basic international norms, as documented by the International Labor Organization (ILO), the U.S. Department of State and multiple non-governmental organizations.

More than a year ago, in November 2003, a number of us wrote to you outlining these problems in detail. We had hoped that doing so might lead to actions to remedy those problems, or at least to a constructive dialogue about them. However, the Members who signed that letter have yet to receive any response to the list of problems documented in that letter—either from your office or from the countries concerned. In fact,

the labor laws in at least one of the CAFTA countries have been weakened in recent months.

In light of the fact that Congress may soon be considering the CAFTA, it is important to move beyond rhetoric to the facts. We urge you to provide documented information concerning any amendments CAFTA countries have made to their laws to address the shortcomings noted in the attached list. Those shortcomings cannot be overcome with better enforcement efforts. Even the best enforcement of inadequate laws—whether relating to intellectual property, services regulation or technical standards for manufactured products—cannot yield acceptable results.

We support the right CAFTA for the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic, just as we have strongly supported the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) programs. These programs have done much to strengthen economic ties with our friends and neighbors in Central America and the Caribbean in ways that benefit both the United States and the region.

However, the CBI programs were built on the dual pillars of expanded economic opportunity and a strong framework for trade. In particular, the programs were expressly conditioned on the countries making progress in achieving basic labor standards. By contrast, the CAFTA moves backward by not including even these minimum standards, and using instead a standard for each country of "enforce your own laws." Ensuring that the CAFTA countries both adopt and effectively maintain in their laws the most basic standards of decency and fairness to working people is important to their workers, their societies, and to U.S. workers. It also is critical to ensuring strong and sustainable economic growth and promoting increased standards of living.

We welcome and support all efforts to improve the capacity of Central American countries to improve the enforcement of their labor laws. In fact, for the last four years, we have fought for better funding of such programs and against massive Administration budget cuts for labor technical assistance programs—many of these programs eroded-out or slashed by up to 90 percent in budgets submitted by the Administration. The Administration's track record gives us little confidence that the one-time grant of \$20 million included in the FY05 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for labor and environmental technical assistance in the CAFTA countries represents the kind of real and sustained commitment needed in these areas. Moreover, such efforts on enforcement are no substitute for getting it right on basic laws.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Trade.

XAVIER BECERRA,  
Member.

CHARLES B. RANGEL,  
Ranking Member.

SANDER M. LEVIN,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Social Security.

U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION REPORTS CONFIRM DEFICIENCIES IN CAFTA LABOR LAWS

The 2004 U.S. State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, the October 2003 ILO Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work: A Labor Law Study ("the Report"), and other ILO reports released in recent years confirm the existence of at least 20 areas in which the labor laws in the

CAFTA countries fail to comply with two of the most basic international norms of common decency and fairness to working people—the rights of association (ILO Convention 87) and to organize and bargain collectively (ILO Convention 98).

Each of these deficiencies, discussed in detail below, was identified in a letter sent in November 2003, from Reps. Rangel, Levin and Becerra to then U.S. Trade Representative Zoellick. Neither USTR nor the governments of the Central American countries have provided information responding to these inconsistencies.

#### COSTA RICA

Use of Solidarity Associations to Bypass Unions. Costa Rican law allows employers to establish "solidarity associations" and to bargain directly with such associations, even where a union has been established. The failure to explicitly prohibit employers from bypassing unions in favor of employer-based groups violates ILO Convention 98.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "[T]he report of the technical assistance mission . . . drew attention to the great imbalance in the private sector between the number of collective agreements and the number of direct pacts . . . the CEACR recalled that direct negotiation between employers and workers' representatives was envisaged 'only in the absence of trade union organizations.'"

(2) Onerous Strike Requirements. Costa Rican law includes a number of onerous procedural requirements for a strike to be called. These requirements contravene ILO guidelines for regulation of strikes, and taken as a whole, make it nearly impossible for a strike to be called. For example, Costa Rica requires that 60% of all workers in a facility vote in favor of a strike in order for it to be legal. These requirements violate ILO Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "The general requirements set out by the legislator [sic] for a strike to be legal . . . include the requirement that at least 60 per cent of the workers in the enterprise support strike action. The CEACR has stated that if a member State deems it appropriate to establish in its legislation provisions for the requirement of a vote by workers before a strike can be held, 'it should ensure that account is taken only of the votes cast, and that the required quorum and majority are fixed at a reasonable level.'"

(3) Inadequate Protection Against Anti-Union Discrimination. Costa Rica's laws do not provide for swift action against anti-union discrimination. For example, there is no accelerated judicial review for dismissal of union leaders.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "[A]s the CEACR has indicated, legislation needs to be amended 'to expedite judicial proceedings concerning anti-union discrimination and to ensure that the decisions thereby are implemented by effective means.'"

#### EL SALVADOR

(1) Inadequate Protection Against Anti-Union Discrimination. El Salvador fails to provide adequate protection against anti-union discrimination. In particular, El Salvador fails to provide for reinstatement of workers fired because of anti-union discrimination, which violates ILO Convention 98. There also are widespread reports of blacklisting in export processing zones of workers who join unions. Salvadoran law does not prohibit blacklisting, as it bars only anti-union discrimination against employees, not job applicants.

The 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices confirms this deficiency: "The Labor Code does not require



that employers reinstate illegally dismissed workers. . . . Workers and the ILO reported instances of employers using illegal pressure to discourage organizing, including the dismissal of labor activists and the circulation of lists of workers who would not be hired because they had belonged to Unions."

(2) Restrictive Requirements for Formation of Industrial Unions. El Salvador has repeatedly been cited by the U.S. State Department and the ILO for using union registration requirements to impede the formation of unions. These formalities violate ILO Convention 87.

The 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices confirms this deficiency: "[I]n some cases supported by the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association . . . the Government impeded workers from exercising their right of association. . . . [T]he government and judges continued to use excessive formalities as a justification to deny applications for legal standing to unions and federations."

A 1999 Report by the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association confirms this deficiency: The Committee observes that "legislation imposes a series of excessive formalities for the recognition of a trade union and the acquisition of legal personality that are contrary to the principle of the free establishment of trade union organizations. . . ."

#### GUATEMALA

(1) Inadequate Protection Against Anti-Union Discrimination. Guatemala's laws do not adequately deter anti-union discrimination. The failure to provide adequate protection from anti-union discrimination violates Convention 98.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices: "An ineffective legal system and inadequate penalties for violations hindered enforcement of the right to form unions and participate in trade union activities. . . ."

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "[T]he CEACR hopes that . . . measures will soon be adopted to ensure rapid and effective compliance with judicial decisions ordering the reinstatement in their jobs of workers dismissed for trade union activities and that effective penalties will be established for failure to comply with such decisions."

Note: In August 2004, the Constitutional Court of Guatemala issued a ruling rescinding the authority of the Ministry of Labor to impose fines for labor rights violations. Following this decision, it is not clear whether Guatemala's law permits any fines to be assessed for labor violations.

(2) Restrictive Requirements for Formation of Industrial Unions. Guatemala requires a majority of workers in an industry to vote in support of the formation of an industry-wide union for the union to be recognized. This requirement violates Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices: The high, industry-wide threshold creates "a nearly insurmountable barrier to the formation of new industry-wide unions."

(3) Onerous Requirements to Strike. Guatemalan law includes a number of provisions that interfere with the right to strike. The Guatemalan Labor Code mandates that unions obtain permission from a labor court to strike, even where workers have voted in favor of striking. In addition, the Labor Code requires a majority of a firm's workers to vote in favor of the strike. These laws violate Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human

Rights Practices: Noting that "procedural hurdles" helped to make legal strikes rare, the Report states, "The Labor Code requires approval by simple majority of a firm's workers to call a legal strike. The Labor Code requires that a labor court consider whether workers are conducting themselves peacefully and have exhausted available mediation before ruling on the legality of a strike."

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "[O]ne of the general requirements laid down in the legislation . . . is still under criticism by the CEACR: 'only the votes cast should be counted in calculating the majority and . . . the quorum should be set at a reasonable level.'"

(4) Ambiguity in Certain Criminal Penalties. Guatemala's Penal Code provides for criminal penalties against anyone who disrupts the operation of enterprises that contribute to the economic development of the country. Whether and how these penalties apply to workers engaged in a lawful strike is unclear, and this ambiguity has deterred workers from exercising their right to strike. The CEACR has stated that application of these penalties to a worker who engaged in a lawful strike would violate ILO Conventions 87 and 98.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "The CEACR has drawn the attention of the Government to the fact that certain provisions of the Penal Code are not compatible with ILO Conventions . . . noting that . . . sentences of imprisonment can be imposed as a punishment . . . for participation in a strike."

(5) Restrictions on Union Leadership. Guatemala maintains a number of restrictions with respect to union leadership including: (1) restricting leadership positions to Guatemalan nationals; and (2) requiring that union leaders be currently employed in the occupation represented by the union. These restrictions violate Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "Both the Constitution and the Labour Code prohibit foreign nationals from holding office in a trade union. . . . The Labour Code requires officials to be workers in the enterprise. . . . These restrictions have given rise to observations by the CEACR."

#### HONDURAS

(1) Burdensome Requirements for Union Recognition. Honduran law requires more than 30 workers to form a trade union. This numerical requirement acts as a bar to the establishment of unions in small firms, and violates ILO Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices: "The [ILO] has noted that various provisions in the labor law restrict freedom of association, including . . . the requirement of more than 30 workers to constitute a trade union. . . ."

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "[T]he requirement to have more than 30 workers to constitute a trade union . . . has prompted the CEACR to comment that this number is 'not conducive to the formation of trade unions in small, and medium size enterprises.'"

(2) Limitations on the Number of Unions. Honduran law prohibits the formation of more than one trade union in a single enterprise. This restriction violates ILO Convention 87 on the right of workers to join or establish organizations of their own choosing, and fosters the creation of monopoly unions.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices: "The [ILO] has noted that various provisions in the labor law restrict freedom of association, including the prohi-

bition of more than 1 trade union in a single enterprise. . . ."

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "Such a provision, in the view of the CEACR, is contrary to Article 2 of Convention No. 87, since the law should not institutionalize a de facto monopoly. . . ."

(3) Restrictions on Union Leadership. Honduras requires that union leaders be Honduran nationals, and be employed in the occupation that the union represents. These restrictions violate ILO Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices: "The [ILO] has noted that various provisions in the labor law restrict freedom of association, including . . . the prohibition on foreign nationals holding union office, the requirement that union officials must be employed in the economic activity of the business the union represents. . . ."

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "The Labour Code prohibits foreign nationals from holding trade union offices and requires officials to be engaged in the activity, profession or trade characteristic of the trade union. . . . The CEACR has objected to these provisions, which it deems incompatible with Article 3 of Convention No. 87. . . ."

(4) Inadequate Protection Against Anti-Union Discrimination. The ILO CEACR has faulted Honduras for a number of years for not providing adequate sanctions for anti-union discrimination. For example, under the law, only a very small fine equivalent to approximately US\$12-\$600 can be assessed against employers for interfering with the right of association. This Honduran law violates ILO Convention 98.

This deficiency was confirmed by a 2004 Report of the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR): "The penalties envisaged . . . against persons impairing the right to freedom of association (from 200 to 2,000 lempiras, with 200 lempiras being equivalent to around \$12) had been deemed inadequate by one worker's confederation. . . . The Committee once again hopes that [legislation will be prepared] providing for sufficiently effective and dissuasive sanctions against all acts of anti-union discrimination."

(5) Few Protections Against Employer Interference in Union Activities. Honduras prohibits employers or employees with ties to management from joining a union; it does not, however, prohibit employers from interfering in union activities through financial or other means. The failure to preclude employer involvement violates ILO Convention 98 on the right to organize and bargain collectively.

This deficiency was confirmed in a 2004 Report of the ILO CEACR: "[T]he Convention provides for broader protection for workers' . . . organizations against any acts of interference . . . in particular, acts which are designed to promote the establishment of workers' organizations under the domination of employers or employers' organizations, or to support workers' organizations by financial or other means, with the object of placing such organizations under the control of employers or employers' organizations. In this respect, the Committee once again hopes that [labor law reform will include provisions] designed to . . . afford full and adequate protection against any acts of interference, as well as sufficiently effective and dissuasive sanctions against such acts."

(6) Restrictions on Federations. Honduras prohibits federations from calling strikes. The CEACR has criticized this prohibition, which contravenes the right to organize.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "Federations and confederations do not have a recognized right to strike . . . which has prompted the CEACR to recall that such provisions are contrary to Articles 3, 5 and 6 of Convention No. 87 . . ."

(7) Onerous Strike Requirements. Honduras requires that two-thirds of union members must support a strike for it to be legal. This requirement violates ILO Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: "[T]he CEACR has recalled that restrictions on the right to strike should not be such as to make it impossible to call a strike in practice, and that a simple majority of voters calculated on the basis of the workers present at the assembly should be sufficient to be able to call a strike."

#### NICARAGUA

(1) Inadequate Protection Against Anti-Union Discrimination. Nicaragua's laws permit employers to fire employees who are attempting to organize a union as long as they provide double the normal severance pay. This allowance violates ILO Convention 98.

This deficiency was confirmed in the October 2003 ILO Report: The Annex to the Report states that the Labor Code provides that "if the employer does not carry out reinstatement, he/she shall pay double the compensation according to the length of service."

(2) Use of Solidarity Associations to Bypass Unions. Nicaragua allows employers to create "solidarity associations" but does not specify how those associations relate to unions. The failure to include protections against employers using solidarity associations to interfere with union activities violates ILO Convention 98.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices: "The Labor Code recognizes cooperatives into which many trans-

portation and agricultural workers are organized. Representatives of most organized labor groups criticized these cooperatives and assert that they do not permit strikes, have inadequate grievance procedures, are meant to displace genuine, independent trade unions and are dominated by employers."

(3) Procedural Impediments to Calling a Strike. Nicaragua maintains a number of restrictive procedural requirements for calling strikes. (According to the 2002 U.S. State Department Human Rights Report, the Nicaraguan Labor Ministry asserts that it would take approximately 6 months for a union to go through the entire process to be permitted to have a legal strike.) Since all legal protections may be withdrawn in the case of an illegal strike, the practical outcome is that workers who strike often lose their jobs, thus undermining the right to strike protected by Convention 87.

This deficiency was confirmed in the 2004 U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices: "Observers contend that the [process for calling a strike] is inappropriately lengthy and so complex that there have been few legal strikes since the 1996 Labor Code came into effect . . ."

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOBSON (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of traveling with the President in Ohio.

Mr. LAHOOD (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of attending a funeral in Chicago.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BORDALLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCOTTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, June 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, June 13.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 13, 2005, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. PATRICK CREAMER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 30 AND APR. 2, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Patrick Creamer .....	3/30	3/30	Jordan .....	139.50	197.00	.....	(?)	.....	.....	139.50	197.00
	3/31	3/31	Ethiopia .....	.....	136.00	.....	(?)	.....	.....	.....	136.00
	3/31	4/1	Uganda .....	.....	157.00	.....	(?)	.....	.....	.....	157.00
	4/1	4/1	Tanzania .....	.....	.....	.....	(?)	.....	.....	.....	.....
	4/2	4/2	Turkey .....	.....	111.00	.....	(?)	.....	.....	.....	111.00
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	139.50	601.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	601.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

PATRICK CREAMER, May 12, 2005.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. FRED L. TURNER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 16 AND APR. 19, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Fred L. Turner .....	4/16	4/19	Denmark .....	3,573.75	615.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,573.75	615.00
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	3,573.75	615.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,573.75	615.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FRED L. TURNER, May 18, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALAN TENNILLE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 22 AND APR. 26, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Alan Tennille .....	4/22	4/24	Colombia .....		568.00						568.00
	4/24	4/26	Costa Rica .....		438.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				438.00
Committee total .....					1,006.00						1,006.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

ALAN TENNILLE, May 13, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DARIN GARDNER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 7 AND MAY 12, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Darin Gardner .....	5/7	5/12	Jordan .....		295.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,180.00
Committee total .....					295.00						1,180.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

KAY GRANGER, Chairman, May 19, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 16 AND APR. 19, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings .....	4/16	4/19	Denmark .....	3,573.75	615.00					3,573.75	615.00
Committee total .....				3,573.75	615.00					3,573.75	615.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, May 18, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 10 AND MAY 14, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings .....	5/10	5/11	Denmark .....	1,165.50	201.00					1,165.50	201.00
	5/11	5/14	Norway .....		1,122.00						1,122.00
Committee total .....				1,165.50	1,323.00					1,165.50	1,323.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, May 26, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CZECH REPUBLIC AND LITHUANIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 6 AND MAY 8, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Jack Kingston .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Hon. Clay Shaw .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Hon. Spencer Bachus .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Hon. Tim Holden .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Hon. Bill Shuster .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Hon. David Scott .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Bill Johnso .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Scott Palmer .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Brenda Becker .....	5/6	5/8	Czech Republic .....		356.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				356.00
Hon. Jack Kingston .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Hon. Clay Shaw .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Hon. Spencer Bachus .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Hon. Tim Holden .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Hon. Bill Shuster .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Hon. David Scott .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Bill Johnso .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Scott Palmer .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Brenda Becker .....	5/8	5/10	Lithuania .....		255.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				255.00
Committee total .....					5,499.00						5,499.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

JACK KINGSTON, Chairman, May 23, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. C.L. "Butch" Otter .....	8/2	8/4	Venezuela .....		849.00		2,046.20				2,895.20
Committee total .....					849.00		2,046.20				2,895.20

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, May 11, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. John Boehner <sup>(3)</sup> <sup>(4)</sup> .....	11/23	11/28	Austria, Kosovo and Greece .....		850.00		3,845.98		25,234.64		29,930.62
Hon. John Carter <sup>(5)</sup> .....	1/11	1/18	Iraq and Afghanistan .....								
Hon. Bob Inglis <sup>(5)</sup> .....	2/24	2/28	Iraq, Kuwait, Jordan, and Germany ....								
Hon. Dennis Kucinich <sup>(6)</sup> .....	3/17	3/28	Paris, Toulouse, Rome, and Madrid .....		967.00				23,153.53		24,120.53
Hon. Howard "Buck" McKeon <sup>(5)</sup> .....	3/18	3/31	China and Hong Kong .....		4,272.00				18,481.72		22,753.72
Hon. Carolyn McCarthy .....	3/18	3/31	China and Hong Kong .....		4,272.00						4,272.00
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa .....	3/18	3/30	Beijing, China .....		2,528.00						2,528.00
Hon. Ron Kind .....	3/18	3/30	Beijing, China .....		2,528.00						2,528.00
Paula Nowakowski .....	3/18	3/31	China and Hong Kong .....		4,152.00						4,152.00
Amy Lozupone .....	3/18	3/31	China and Hong Kong .....		4,152.00						4,152.00
George Canty .....	3/18	3/31	China and Hong Kong .....		4,152.00						4,152.00
Committee total .....											98,588.87

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Previously reported w/o expenditures.<sup>4</sup> Transportation and other purposes are cumulative for entire CODEL.<sup>5</sup> Expenditures not yet available.<sup>6</sup> Other purposes expenditures are cumulative for entire CODEL.

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Chairman, Jun. 3, 2005.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Kathleen Reilly .....	1/16	1/20	Asia .....		1,404.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....							3,694.77				5,098.77
Robert Myhill .....	1/16	1/20	Asia .....		1,404.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....							3,694.77				5,098.77
Marcel Lettre .....	1/16	1/20	Asia .....		1,404.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....						3,454.27					4,858.27
Michael Ennis .....	1/15	1/18	Asia .....		1,005.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	1/18	1/20	Asia .....		822.00		5,819.86				7,646.86
Michael Fogarty .....	1/15	1/18	Asia .....		1,005.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	1/18	1/20	Asia .....		822.00		5,819.86				7,646.86
Christopher Donesa .....	1/15	1/18	Asia .....		1,005.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	1/18	1/20	Asia .....		822.00		5,819.86				7,646.86
Hon. Rush Holt .....	2/20	2/21	Europe .....		353.89						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	2/21	2/23	Europe .....		482.00						
Wyndee Parker .....	2/19	2/21	Europe .....		924.00		3,374.82				4,210.71
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	2/21	2/23	Europe .....		482.00						
Hon. Mike Rogers .....	3/19	3/20	Middle East .....		178.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/20	3/23	Middle East .....		626.00						
Kathleen Reilly .....	3/23	3/24	Middle East .....		508.00						1,312.00
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/19	3/20	Middle East .....		178.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/20	3/23	Middle East .....		626.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/23	3/24	Middle East .....		508.00						1,312.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra .....	3/20	3/25	Asia .....		1,624.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....							5,578.15				7,202.15
Mike Meermans .....	3/20	3/22	Asia .....		266.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/22	3/25	Asia .....		928.00						
Michael Ennis .....	3/20	3/22	Asia .....		266.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/22	3/25	Asia .....		928.00						
Beth Larson .....	3/20	3/22	Asia .....		266.00		6,291.15				7,485.15
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/20	3/23	Asia .....		928.00						
Jeremy Bash .....	3/20	3/22	Asia .....		266.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....	3/22	3/25	Asia .....		928.00		5,791.15				6,985.15
Hon. Robert Cramer .....	12/26	1/02	Europe .....		2,746.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation .....							6,630.15				7,824.15
Commercial aircraft transportation .....							6,568.56				9,314.56
Committee total .....											102,744.19

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PETER HOEKSTRA, Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2253. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — American Indian Livestock Feed Program, Livestock Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AH26) received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2254. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Brucellosis in Swine; Add Florida to List of Validated Brucellosis-Free States [Docket No. 05-009-1] received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2255. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill "To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees to cover administrative and supervisory costs, to extend the authorization of appropriations for such Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2256. A letter from the Acting Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting written notification of advance billing, reasons for the advance billing, an analysis of the effects of the advance billing on military readiness, and an analysis of the effects of the advance billing on the customer, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2208; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2257. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Lieutenant General Ronald E. Keys, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2258. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Vice Admiral Gary Roughead, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2259. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Charles E. Croom, Jr., United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2260. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Clyde A. Vaughn, Army National Guard of the United States, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2261. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Reporting Contract Performance Outside the United States [DFARS Case 2004-D001] received April 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2262. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, De-

partment of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Unique Item Identification and Valuation [DFARS Case 2003-D081] received April 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2263. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Contractor Personnel Supporting a Force Deployed Outside the United States [DFARS Case 2003-D087] received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2264. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, OCAO, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-04; Introduction — received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2265. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance [Docket No. FEMA-7776] received May 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2266. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revised Guidelines for Previous Participation Certification [Docket No. FR-4870-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI10) received April 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2267. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Treble Damages for Failure to Engage in Loss Mitigation [Docket No. FR-4553-F-03] (RIN: 2501-AC66) received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2268. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule for Submission of One-Time and Up-Front Mortgage Insurance Premiums [Docket No. FR-4690-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AH67) received April 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2269. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — International Banking (RIN: 3064-AC85) received April 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2270. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Loan Interest Rates — received April 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2271. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Conversion of Insured Credit Unions to Mutual Savings Banks — received May 5, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2272. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment to Rule 4-01(a) of Regulation S-X Regarding the Compliance Date for Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 123 (Revised 2004), Share-Based Payment [Release Nos. 33-8568, 34-51558; 35-27959; IC-26833; FR-74] (RIN: 3235-AJ39) received April 18,

2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2273. A letter from the Acting Commissioner for Education Statistics, Director, Institute of Education Sciences, Department of Education, transmitting a statistical report prepared by the National Center for Education Statistics entitled, "The Condition of Education," pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 9005; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2274. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Model Milestones for NRC Adjudicatory Proceedings (RIN: 3150-AH71) received April 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2275. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Export and Import of Nuclear Equipment and Material; Exports to Syria Embargoed (RIN: 3150-AH67) received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2276. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2004, through March 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2277. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of an alteration in leased space prospectus for the James L. King Federal Building in Miami, FL; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2278. A letter from the Deputy Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NARA Facility Locations and Hours (RIN: 3095-AB47) received May 5, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2279. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Employment of Relatives (RIN: 3206-AK03) received April 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2280. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Environmental Differential Pay for Asbestos Exposure (RIN: 3206-AK64) received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2281. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan; Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason [Docket No. 050125016-5097-02; I.D. 011805C] (RIN: 0648-AS61) received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2282. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the designation as "foreign terrorist organization" pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1189; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2283. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an amendment to a designation as "foreign terrorist organization" pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1189; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2284. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Girl Scouts of the United States of America 2004 Annual Report, pursuant to Public Law 105-225 section 803 112 stat. 1362; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2285. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Grant Cooperative Agreement Handbook — Research Misconduct. (RIN: 2700-AD11) received April 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

2286. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Grant and Cooperative Agreement Handbook — Research Misconduct (RIN: 2700-AD11) received May 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

2287. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, OAR, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NOAA Climate and Global Change Program for FY 2006 [Docket No.: 000616180-5104-11] received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

2288. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, VA, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Elimination of Copayment for Smoking Cessation Counseling (RIN: 2900-AM11) received May 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2289. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, VA, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Veterans Education: Non-payment of VA Educational Assistance to Fugitive Felons (RIN: 2900-AL79) received May 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2290. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-23) received April 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2291. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Fourth Annual report pursuant to the College Scholarship Fraud Prevention Act of 2000; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and the Judiciary.

2292. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Annual Report for calendar year 2004, entitled "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board," as required by Section 316(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2286e(b); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 184. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to provide authority to the Attorney General to authorize any controlled substance that is in schedule I or II or is a nar-

cotic drug in schedule III or IV to be exported from the United States to a country for subsequent export from that country to another country, if certain conditions are met; with amendments (Rept. 109-115 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 869. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to lift the patient limitation on prescribing drug addiction treatments by medical practitioners in group practices, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-116 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 517. A bill to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-117 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 184. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than July 11, 2005.

H.R. 869. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than July 11, 2005.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2828. A bill to ensure that the United States leads the world in developing and manufacturing next generation energy technologies, to grow the economy of the United States, to create new highly trained, highly skilled American jobs, to eliminate American overdependence on foreign oil, and to address the threat of global warming; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Government Reform, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 2829. A bill to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLINE, Mr. McKEON, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2830. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the pension funding rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and

the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H.R. 2831. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in benefit accrual standards; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 2832. A bill to establish certain conditions on the Secretary of Veterans Affairs implementing any recommendation of the CARES Commission that would have the effect of eliminating or severely reducing any medical service provided to veterans throughout the United States at Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 2833. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on NaMBT; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2834. A bill to assure quality and best value with respect to Federal construction projects by prohibiting the practice known as bid shopping; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BARROW, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WEINER, Ms. LEE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BACA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, Mr. FORD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve recruitment, preparation, distribution, and retention of public elementary and secondary school teachers and principals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 2836. A bill to extend the duty suspension on Allyl isosulfocyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 2837. A bill to extend the duty suspension on sodium methylate powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 2838. A bill to extend the duty suspension on Trimethyl cyclo hexanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 2839. A bill to extend the duty suspension on 2,2-Dimethyl-3-(3-methylphenyl)propanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that agencies, in promulgating rules, take into consideration the impact of such rules on the privacy of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of home needle destruction devices and the disposal of needles and lancets through a sharps-by-mail or similar program under part D of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. FEENEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas):

H.R. 2842. A bill to require the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to use dynamic economic modeling in addition to static economic modeling in the preparation of budgetary estimates of proposed changes in Federal revenue law; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2843. A bill to prohibit the use of remote control locomotives to carry hazardous materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 to foster greater understanding of human dietary eating patterns and food intake, physical activity level, food security, dietary exposure, and nutritional status; to provide timely information to public program managers and private sector decision makers to improve nutritional intake, physical activity, health, productivity and other measures of quality of life of Americans, based on scientifically established norms and the knowledge and experience developed under the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 over the past decade; to reauthorize nutrition monitoring

programs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2845. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plain woven fabrics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LoBIONDO (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 2846. A bill to ensure the continuation and improvement of coastal restoration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2847. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on 1,3-Benzenedicarboxamide, N, N'-Bis(2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-4-piperidinyl)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2848. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on reaction products of phosphorus trichloride with 1,1'-biphenyl and 2,4-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)phenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2849. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on preparations based on ethanediamide, N-(2-ethoxyphenyl)-N'-(4-isodecylphenyl)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2850. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on 1-Acetyl-4-(3-dodecyl-2,5-dioxo-1-pyrrolidinyl)-2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2851. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on 3-Dodecyl-1-(2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-4-piperidinyl)-2,5-pyrrolid nedione; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2852. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Tetraacetylenediamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2853. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on sodium petroleum sulfonate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2854. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on esters and sodium esters of parahydroxybenzoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2855. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on Oxalic Anilide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2856. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain inflatable balls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ORTIZ:

H.R. 2857. A bill to require the immediate release, in unclassified form, of all documentation and other information used by the Secretary of Defense to prepare the recommendations submitted to Congress on May 13, 2005, regarding the closure and realignment of military installations in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 2858. A bill to establish and strengthen postsecondary programs and courses in the subjects of traditional American history, free institutions, and Western civilization, available to students preparing to teach these subjects, and to other students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2859. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide improved interest rate relief for servicemembers during periods of military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 2860. A bill to encourage Members of Congress and the executive branch to be honest with the public about true on-budget circumstances, to exclude the Social Security trust funds and the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund from the annual Federal budget baseline, to prohibit Social Security and Medicare hospital insurance trust funds surpluses to be used as offsets for tax cuts or spending increases, and to exclude the Social Security trust funds and the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund from official budget surplus/deficit pronouncements; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2861. A bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the number of persons in each State who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that, as Congress and all Americans learned the identity of "Deep Throat" as W. Mark Felt this week, it commends and honors W. Mark Felt for his uncommon courage and bravery in exposing major Government corruption and encourages other FBI employees aware of wrongdoing to follow the lead of this model whistleblower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DeLAURO (for herself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. SANDERS):

H. Res. 311. A resolution recognizing the importance of the decision of the Supreme Court, *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which 40 years ago held that married couples have a constitutional right to use contraceptives, thereby recognizing the legal right of women to control their fertility through birth control and providing for vast improvements in maternal and infant health and for significant reductions in the rate of unintended pregnancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. FRANK of

Massachusetts, Mr. NEY, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. HARRIS):

H. Res. 312. A resolution recognizing National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 98: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 111: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 136: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 147: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 181: Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 297: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 356: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 398: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 475: Mrs. MCCARTHY and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 476: Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 515: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 535: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 551: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 554: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 558: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 583: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 596: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 602: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 609: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 699: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 719: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 809: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 818: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 819: Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 827: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 831: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 864: Mr. WYNN and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 893: Mr. REYES, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 916: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 930: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 949: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1048: Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD.

H.R. 1056: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 1108: Mr. FILNER and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1125: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1131: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1175: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1183: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1186: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1201: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1216: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1227: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1245: Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. DENT, Mr. CANNON and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1262: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1264: Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1288: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MACK, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1290: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1298: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1306: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BERRY, Mr. FORD, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1310: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1348: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1355: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1402: Mr. BOUCHER and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1406: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1409: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1424: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 1431: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1456: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1540: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1554: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1578: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1582: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1588: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1602: Mr. KUHL of New York, Ms. HART, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1607: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1634: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 1652: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1671: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1689: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1696: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1697: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1704: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 1712: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WU, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SABO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1714: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1737: Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1770: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1798: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1850: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1851: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1872: Mr. PORTER and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1898: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1902: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1946: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1957: Mr. FORBES and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1961: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1973: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1986: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2034: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 2061: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FORD, Mr. MANZULLO, and Miss MCMORRIS.

H.R. 2072: Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2089: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 2108: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2112: Mr. PENCE, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 2122: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2133: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2209: Mr. TANNER and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 2229: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 2317: Ms. WATSON and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2327: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. WU.

H.R. 2349: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2359: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 2363: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 2387: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2389: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 2455: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2498: Mr. BARROW, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. McHUGH, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 2525: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2574: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2641: Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. FORD, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 2646: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2648: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 2662: Mr. BACA and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2680: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 2688: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2694: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2695: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2717: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. RENZI, Mr. NEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 2737: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2793: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2811: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. SABO.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. McGOVERN and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. BACHUS.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 158: Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD.

H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. BARROW.

H. Res. 199: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. OLVER.

H. Res. 220: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. MELANCON.

H. Res. 259: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WATT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. WYNN.

H. Res. 297: Mr. BEAUPREZ.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 2 by Mr. MARSHALL on House Resolution 270: Charles A. Gonzalez, Melissa L. Bean, Lincoln Davis, Jerry F. Costello, Nita M. Lowey, Eliot L. Engel, Solomon P. Ortiz, Luis V. Gutierrez, John D. Dingell, and Robert Wexler.